

## El *Benedictus* (Lc 1,68-79) a través del arameo

El investigar en el *Benedictus* tomando como punto de partida su posible trasfondo arameo está justificado, porque Lc (1,67) atribuye este canto a Zacarías que con toda probabilidad se expresaba en arameo, lengua franca de la Palestina donde se sitúa el relato<sup>(1)</sup>. Consiguientemente de modo implícito Lc presenta el texto griego como una interpretación del pensamiento arameo.

Las diversas teorías sobre el lenguaje, el autor, el origen, los contenidos, el sentido y la forma del *Benedictus*<sup>(2)</sup>, que se tienen en cuenta, no condicionan el desarrollo del tema, que trata de descubrir el posible arameo tras el *Benedictus* y lo que esto aporta a su comprensión. Al realizar este estudio, el primero en su género, se irán iluminando diversos aspectos que tomados en conjunto servirán al final para esbozar una plausible teoría sobre la naturaleza del *Benedictus*, que se presentará también traducido al arameo. En esta labor ayudarán los documentos que testifican el arameo del s. I en Palestina, como son sobre todo los de Qumrán así como su marco, el arameo del AT y el del Targum (T), con una atención especial además a las versiones siríacas clásicas de los Evangelios que contienen el *Benedictus*: la Sinaítica (S), la Peshitta (P) y la Heraclense (H), sin desdeñar tampoco las traducciones de este himno al hebreo realizadas tanto en trabajos particulares<sup>(3)</sup> como en las

(<sup>1</sup>) K. BEYER, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* I (Göttingen 1984) 49-58; II (Göttingen 1994) 29-30. Para algunos aspectos a tener en cuenta al afrontar el arameo de los evangelios cf. M. CASEY, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge 1998) 1-72.

(<sup>2</sup>) S. MUÑOZ IGLESIAS, *Los Evangelios de la Infancia* I (Madrid 1990) 163-196; R.E. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah* (London 1993) 346-355, 377-387, 656-661.

(<sup>3</sup>) A. Resch, F.X. Zorell, R.A. Aytoun, H. Sahlin, P. Winter. Estas traducciones presentadas en los trabajos que se mencionarán oportunamente aparecen recogidas en MUÑOZ, *Evangelios*, 326-330. El mismo S. Muñoz a lo largo de su estudio sobre el *Benedictus* va diseminando sus comentarios a este himno en hebreo. A todas estas traducciones hay que añadir la de Ch. TORREY, "The Translations made from the original Aramaic Gospels", *Studies in the History of Religion presented to C.H. Toy* (New York 1912) 294. Todas estas traducciones adolecen del defecto fundamental de falta de fidelidad al texto griego.

traducciones del NT, y considerando también el arameo de la lectura palestinese (LP) del Evangelio en los siglos V-VI<sup>(4)</sup>.

Sobre la naturaleza general del *Benedictus* no hay duda: es una alabanza, una *Berakah* o reconocimiento admirativo y alegre de los beneficios de Dios. La fórmula con la que se inicia este himno puede ser también medial o final<sup>(5)</sup>, pero como exclamación espontánea (Mt 11,25) determina sobre todo un comienzo, por lo que se la ve abriendo diversos himnos en la Biblia y en Qumrán<sup>(6)</sup>. La fórmula de la *Berakah* se conoce también en el arameo bíblico (Dn 3,28) y en el arameo qumránico (AQ)<sup>(7)</sup>.

La *Berakah* se inicia en el VERSO 68 con εὐλογητός, frecuente en el AT (c. 53x). El uso de este término se reserva en LXX preferentemente para la alabanza a Dios, a quien se le considera digno de loa<sup>(8)</sup>. A él le corresponde en hebreo בריך y en arameo ܒܪܝܚ. Cuando como alabanza a Dios aparece מברך LXX lo traduce con un circunloquio (Dn 2,20 Sl 113,2) o, si el sujeto es “su Nombre”, con εὐλογημένον (Jb 1,21), término raramente aplicado a Dios<sup>(9)</sup>. Por eso su equivalente ܠܒܪܚܐ usado aquí por S, P, H, LP no se acomoda al εὐλογητός, y quizás haya sido elegido en siríaco a pesar de conocer

(<sup>4</sup>) Para las traducciones hebreas del NT cf. J. CARMIGNAC, *Traductions hébraïques des Evangiles I-V* (Turnhout 1982-1985); G.B. Iona, Th. Yates, W. Greenfield, Ch.D. Ginsburg, F. Delitzsch, London Society for Promoting Christian Unity among the Jews. A estas traducciones se puede añadir la publicada por United Bible Societies (Jerusalem 1979). Tampoco en ellas la fidelidad al texto griego es exquisita. Para las lecturas palestineses cf. A.S. LEWIS – M.D. GIBSON, *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels* (London 1899); Ch. MÜLLER – K. and M. SOKOLOFF, *A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic IIA* (Groningen 1998) 136-137.

(<sup>5</sup>) La expresión cierra tres libros del Salterio (Sl 41,14; 72,18; 106,48). Para otros finales, cf. Sl 66,20; 1Cr 16,36. En medio de himnos: Sl 31,22; 124,6 Tb 8,16-17.

(<sup>6</sup>) Exclamación inicial: Gn 24,26 Ex 18,9; 1Sam 25,32; 2Sam 18,28; 1Re 1,48; 5,21; 8,56 Rt 4,14 Zc 11,5 Tb 11,17; 2Mac 1,17; 15,34. Inicio de himnos: Sl 144,1 Dn 3,26 LXX; Tb 3,11; 8,5.15; 13,1; 1Mac 4,30; cp. Neh 9,5. En Qumrán: 1QM 14,4; 1QH 5,10; 10,14; 11,27.19.32; 16,8.

(<sup>7</sup>) 4QDn 2,20; 1QapGn 20,21; 22,16; 4QEn 22,14.

(<sup>8</sup>) Rara vez se emplea este término griego para el ser humano; sólo cuando se le ve en cierta relación con Dios (Dt 7,13; 1Sam 15,13).

(<sup>9</sup>) Este participio perfecto pasivo traduce בריך cuando la alabanza va al ser humano, a quien se le ve o desea “bendecido” o colmado (sentido original de *brk*) de los beneficios de Dios. Rara vez se emplea este término para Dios (Ez 3,12); y entonces con el deseo de que Dios sea alabado (1Re 10,9). En la forma del *Benedictus* el giro es hapax (1Cr 16,36).

ܒܪܝܬ (Gn 24,26; 1 Re 8,56) para distinguirlo de éste con el que se hace también el saludo humano (Sl 118,26).

Aquí surge la cuestión de saber si la forma hay que entenderla en indicativo (“Dios es loable”) o en subjuntivo (“Dios sea alabado”)<sup>(10)</sup>. Tratándose de una alabanza actual a Dios es lógico suponer el indicativo, aunque naturalmente con el deseo de que también otros entren en esa alabanza, concebida como pública<sup>(11)</sup>. Filológicamente, si se tratara de εὐλογημένος – מברך que va con יהי – ע״ה (Jb 1,21) sería un claro deseo. También בריך – εὐλογημένος, sobre todo si va con יהי representa un deseo (γένοιτο: 1 Re 10,9; ἔστω: 2Cr 9,8 cf. et. 4QEn 22,14); y como tal deseo, pero infaliblemente realizable, se puede considerar también cuando le acompaña אלה (Dt 28,3). Lo mismo se diga de בריך – εὐλογητός, referido al ser humano, que va acompañado de תהיה (Dt 7,14). Pero el בריך – εὐλογητός con referencia a Dios hay que entenderlo en indicativo (ע״ה: Dn 3,26-27; 1Cr 29,10; 1Esd 4,60), como una confesión de que Dios “es” loable, merece alabanza. Y así lo entendían los himnos de la época del *Benedictus* (Tb 3,11; 1Mac 4,30). Esto lo confirman además las versiones siríacas, que en vez de usar la expresión del deseo con el verbo ܠܬܝܬܝܢ, usan la cópula afirmativa con el pronombre personal de tercera persona que se emplea aunque se trate de segunda persona<sup>(12)</sup>.

En este momento el cantor podría haber introducido el pronombre personal de segunda persona que aparece en los himnos de la época tardía del AT (1Cr 29,10 Sl 119,12), en los himnos hebreos de Qumrán (1QH 10,14; 11,29; 16,8), y se va haciendo práctica de modo que llegará incluso a sustituir el Nombre inefable de Dios. Se trata de una innovación en la himnología, que irá cobrando cuerpo en la tradición israelítica<sup>(13)</sup>; pero el autor del *Benedictus* prefiere mantenerse fiel a la práctica tradicional, insistiendo en el matiz de reverencia a Dios.

La mención del Nombre de Dios por medio del Tetragrámmaton o de su equivalente es parte de la Berakah típica, aunque en aquella época ya se iba observando su elisión (1QM 14,4). Aquí el Nombre lo representa el κύριος, título con el que LXX sistemáticamente

<sup>(10)</sup> D.L. BOCK, *Luke I* (Grand Rapids 1994) 178.

<sup>(11)</sup> E. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen 1975) 26.

<sup>(12)</sup> L. PALACIOS, *Grammatica syriaca* (Roma 1954) 184-185, 188.

<sup>(13)</sup> J. HEINEMANN, *Prayer in the Talmud* (Berlin 1977) 17, 62, 102, 104-122.

traduce יְהוָה favorecido quizás por la asonancia entre Ιαβε y el arameo ܡܪܗ (<sup>14</sup>), presente tanto en la Biblia (Dn 2,74; 5,32) como en el AQ (1QapGn 20,13.15; 4QEn 9,4; 10,9) y aquí en LP. El hecho de que en los himnos hebreos de Qumrán el tetragrámmaton venga siempre sustituido por אדוני muestra que todas las traducciones del Benedictus al hebreo, que sistemáticamente lo mantienen, son anacrónicas y defectuosas en este punto. Por lo demás, la necesidad de la mención del Nombre y el ritmo del verso confirman aquí la presencia del κύριος (P y H; cf. SAB), omitido en algunos testigos del texto probablemente por homoioteleutón (S, cf. p<sup>4</sup> W).

Al *Dios*, a quien va la alabanza, se le denomina *de Israel*, con sentido comunitario. Para el sustantivo *Dios*, cuando ha de acompañar al genitivo, el arameo antiguo opta por la forma simple del constructo (= absoluto), mientras el arameo literario del Targum preferirá la forma larga del enfático con ܕ, que se va haciendo cada vez más frecuente (<sup>15</sup>). Por otra parte, cuando LXX traduce *Dios de Israel* no hace mediar el artículo entre ambos términos, sugiriendo que en la base está el constructo, como lo muestra el arameo de Esdras (6x). Por eso aquí el extraño τοῦ está sugiriendo una base aramea con ܕ, adición desconocida en hebreo, que no obliga sin embargo a variar la forma simple del sustantivo *Dios*. De este modo el Benedictus está presentando en griego una expresión que no coincide con la habitual de LXX, y sugiere así una base aramea distinta también de la del TM. Es un rasgo presumible de originalidad.

A continuación se señala la razón de la alabanza, característica de toda Berakah (<sup>16</sup>). Esto se puede hacer implícitamente (Tb 8,5), o por medio del participio (Sl 144,1; 1Mac 14,30; 2Mac 15,34); pero la mayoría de las veces (c. 20) se hace con una oración de relativo, también en Qumrán (1QS 11,15; 1QM 14,4; 1QH 11,27), y menos

(<sup>14</sup>) Para esta problemática, cf. G. QUELL – W. FOERSTER, κύριος, TWNT III, 1040-1052. 1056-1057, 1066, 1081-1082. En siríaco la forma normal para “señor” es ܡܪܗ, pero cuando este título se aplica a Dios o a Cristo se usa ܡܪܝܬܐ, que puede representar un aramaísmo occidental, cf. ܡܪܝܬܐ (4QEn 10,9; 11QtgJb 34,12). J. LUZARRAGA, “Las versiones siríacas del Magnificat”, *EstBi* 50 (1992) 105.

(<sup>15</sup>) Es interesante notar que mientras las ediciones de la *Biblia Hebraica* (R. Kittel; 1937) y *Stuttgartensia* (1984) no señalan la ܕ en el giro “Dios de Israel” (Esd 7,15), S. MANDELKERN en su *V.T. Concordantiae* (Tel Aviv 1962) lo constata.

(<sup>16</sup>) J.-P. AUDET, “Esquisse historique du genre littéraire de la ‘bénédictio’ juive et de l’ ‘eucharistie’ chrétienne”, *RB* 65 (1958) 372.



con una causal<sup>(17)</sup>. En ambos casos el verbo va en perfecto. Y para introducir este tipo de oraciones las fuentes arameas aportan el ܐ, no sólo cuando en LXX le corresponde un ὅς (Dn 3,28), sino también cuando el griego tiene que ser ὅτι por el claro sentido causal del ܐ (Dn 2,20.23), que es frecuente en el AQ (1QapGn 20,13-14; 4QEnGi 13,3 etc). Es, pues, razonable traducir aquí el ὅτι con ܐ también porque su matiz está sugiriendo más el relativo que el causal: se le confiesa a Dios loable, no tanto porque ha hecho un gesto concreto sino porque con sus acciones muestra su naturaleza de redentor.

Las razones para la berakah en el AT son de dos tipos: particulares<sup>(18)</sup> o vinculadas de algún modo a la historia salvífica<sup>(19)</sup>. La razón de la alabanza, formulada en el *Benedictus*, es única en su expresión y no se atiene a ningún paralelo bíblico o extrabíblico. De este modo muestra su independencia y originalidad. Sin embargo presenta una razón que, como tema, es conocida en el AT: la visita de Dios. Pero también aquí con matices que conviene resaltar.

El uso religioso de ἐπισκέπτειν referido a la acción de Dios es ajeno al griego clásico y depende de su equiparación con el פקד del AT. Este verbo, sin embargo, aunque usado aquí por LP como siriacismo, no será apto para expresar la visita en arameo, donde tiene sólo sentido de “mandar”. El Targum traduce habitualmente פקד en sentido religioso con דכר<sup>(20)</sup>, determinado quizás por el hecho de que las visitas están dinamizadas por un recuerdo, y es así como aparecen unidos פקד con זכר (Jr 15,15) y סער con דכר (TZc 10,3). Pero דכר señala más la causa de la visita que la visita misma. Y el otro verbo arameo para “visitar”, סער (TlSm 14,17), empleado aquí por las versiones siríacas, tiene un fuerte matiz de conmoción y movimiento, menos apto para aplicarlo a Dios<sup>(21)</sup>. Por eso el verbo

<sup>(17)</sup> Sl 28,6; 31,22 Tb 8,16; 13,2; 1QH 11,32. El matiz de relativo como más frecuente y natural hace, por ejemplo, que muchos Mss lean אשר en vez de ܐ en Sl 31,22.

<sup>(18)</sup> 1Sam 25,32.39; 2Sam 18,28 Sl 28,6; 31,22; 66,20; 124,6; 144,1 Tb 8,16; 11,17.

<sup>(19)</sup> Se mencionan la posteridad de Abraham (Gn 24,27) y la descendencia davídica (1Re 1,48; 5,21; 8,15 cf. et. Rt 4,4) como bien para Israel (1Re 10,9||2Cr 9,8), el descanso concedido a Israel (1Re 8,26) y la victoria sobre sus enemigos (1Mac 4,30; 2Mac 1,17; 19,34). En 1QM 4,4s se alaba a Dios por su bondad en la alianza y por haber fijado tiempo de salvación para el pueblo que ha redimido.

<sup>(20)</sup> TOGn 50,24 TOEx 3,16; 4,31; 13,19 TRt 1,6.

<sup>(21)</sup> Para evitar conmoción en Dios es por lo que LXX sustituye “alegrarse” con “visita” (Jr 32,41).

más propio para traducir ἐπι-σπέντειν en arameo será בִּקֵּר, que no tiene la complicación de sentidos del hebreo פָּקַד<sup>(22)</sup> y en su sentido propio alude a un “in-vestigar” en un documento memorial, que produce un conocimiento y que dinamiza una acción (Esd 4,15.19; 1QapGn 22,29). Este verbo, que en hebreo aparece también para señalar la actitud vigilante del Dios salvador (Ez 34,11 cp. 4Q521,2.5), se emplea en la tradición aramea de Palestina para señalar la visita (cf. vgr. TNGn 35,9 TJIEx 18,10). El matiz de בִּקֵּר aquí estaría aludiendo al gesto de Dios que ve la situación de su pueblo, *investiga* en el memorial de la alianza (v. 72) y actúa en consecuencia. Es así como se concibe la visita salvífica de Dios en el AT (Ex 2,24-25 Sl 106,4), con la que siempre se inicia una nueva etapa salvífica (Ex 3,16 Jr 29,10), como lo indican también los documentos de la época intertestamental (TestJud. 23,5 CD 1,6-7).

Con este sentido se explica también mejor la anomalía de que ἐπισπέντειν aparezca sin complemento, lo que no ocurre cuando se refiere propiamente a una visita. Se le hace tan extraño a S (al que sigue P) encontrar este verbo sin complemento que lo antepone tomándolo de lo que en la frase siguiente es complemento indirecto y permanece como tal con el pronombre; pero esto, que puede ser válido conceptualmente<sup>(23)</sup>, es anómalo estilísticamente en griego, pues supone tratar un dativo como un acusativo. Para evitar esto P mantiene כְּמִלְכָּא como complemento directo e introduce un מִן de complemento indirecto. Todo el giro, sin embargo, se hace menos extraño si se tiene en cuenta que el ל que acompañaría a “su pueblo” en arameo es en esta lengua también señal de acusativo<sup>(24)</sup>. De todos modos el *pueblo* permanece siempre como el beneficiario tanto de la “visita” como la “redención”.

El tiempo del verbo que en griego indica la visita es el aoristo, con el que se señala no sólo una esperanza sino un hecho concreto que podría conectarse con la elección de la Casa de David (v. 69), sin más especificaciones. Pero la alusión a un acontecimiento “en” la Casa de David sugiere una situación concreta. Por otra parte la salvación divisada como liberación de enemigos reales (v. 77) prevé algo, si quizás no plenamente logrado, sí actuado y fundamentalmente asegurado. Por eso al aoristo griego se le puede dar el valor de

<sup>(22)</sup> T. MURAOKA, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids 1998) 120d.

<sup>(23)</sup> H. SCHÜRMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Freiburg a.B. 1969) 86.

<sup>(24)</sup> Th. ZAHN, *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Leipzig 1913) 115.

perfecto semita, considerándolo como profético<sup>(25)</sup>, y que señalaría la certeza de un futuro vinculado a una experiencia salvífica, que aquí el cantor de algún modo la habría sentido ya. Así se explicará también mejor el aoristo del verbo siguiente, que aludiría a una redención que radicalmente se ha iniciado ya<sup>(26)</sup> y que fundamentalmente está vinculada a la alianza (v. 72 cf. Sl 111,4.9). Por esto no es necesario cambiarlo, tampoco junto con el aoristo siguiente, por dos infinitivos constructos hebreos<sup>(27)</sup> pues ello supondría menor fidelidad al texto convirtiendo además la parataxis (más semita) en hipotaxis; y el concepto modal de que “la visita se hace operando la redención” se expresa igualmente en la parataxis, donde se gana en la modalidad de que la liberación es “efecto” de la visita.

La visita de Dios y su salvación van tradicionalmente unidas (Sl 106,4). Y la salvación reviste siempre un matiz de libertad, como lo canta también la Berakah de Jetró (Ex 18,9-10) al describir la acción de Dios que *הציל* (TM) o *שייב* (T) a su pueblo. Pero en el *Benedictus* aparece de nuevo un giro extraño, pues no sólo no se une nunca *ἐπισκέπτειν* con *ποιεῖν λύτρωσιν* sino que tampoco aparece esta expresión en ninguna otra parte<sup>(28)</sup>. Un adicto al uso de LXX hubiera ideado o traducido este concepto con *ἐλυτρώσατο*<sup>(29)</sup>, que corresponde al arameo *פרק* (Dn 4,24), usado aquí por las versiones siríacas. Y si el cantor hubiera querido expresar esta idea con un giro doble tenía el Sl 111,9: *envió* (*שלח* TM y T; *ἀπέστειλεν* LXX) *redención* (*פדויה* TM, *λύτρωσιν* LXX, *פרקנא* T) *a su pueblo*. Pero tampoco sigue este modo, aferrándose a su originalidad.

Al sustantivo *λύτρωσις* no le acompaña nunca en el AT el verbo “hacer”. Si se le da este giro aquí es porque tras *λύτρωσις* se supone un sustantivo similar que puede ir con tal verbo. Como tal sustantivo aparece *σωτηρία*. Y la ecuación plena entre *λύτρωσις* y *σωτηρία* se da en arameo, pues donde LXX lee *λύτρωσις* el Targum tiene

(25) R.H. STEIN, *Luke* (Nashville 1992) 99.

(26) F.X. ZORELL, *Einführung in die Metrik und die Kunstformen der hebräischen Psalmendichtung* (Münster 1914) 46.

(27) Así lo sugiere S. MUÑOZ, *Evangelios*, 200.

(28) De esta expresión no es testigo 4Q511 63-64 II 1 aunque lo afirme U. MITTMANN-RICHERT, *Magnifikat und Benedictus* (Tübingen 1996) 129. Para convencerse fácilmente de ello basta consultar la edición de este texto en M. BAILLET, *Qumran Grotte 4 III (4Q482-4Q520). Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, 7 (Oxford 1982) 247.

(29) Dt 7,8; 15,15; 2Sam 4,9 Sl 106,10; 107,2 cp. Rt 1,6 Si 48,20.

siempre פרקן<sup>(30)</sup>, término habitual para “salvación” y conocido también en el AQ (11QtgJb 5,3 cf. et. MegTaan 12 [33]). Y como a תשועה – σωτηρία le acompaña עשה – ποιεῖν, a פרקא le acompaña עבר (2Sam 23,10.12). Si alguien hubiera concebido este giro en griego, lo hubiera compuesto según el modelo de LXX; y un traductor no hubiera encontrado en hebreo los términos que corresponden a λύτρωσις (פדה y גאלה) como tampoco פליטה, raro equivalente de σωτηρία (2Sam 15,14), pues no se construyen con “hacer”; y si hubiera dado con תשועה o ישועה por inercia lo hubiera traducido con σωτηρία. Si conjuga λύτρωσις con ποιεῖν es porque en la base se halla un giro que puede unir ambos conceptos, como es פרקן, que además da pie para varias traducciones, entre ellas λύτρωσις. Si escoge ésta es porque quiere resaltar el concepto de “redención”<sup>(31)</sup>. El término פרקן, que aquí se presenta en estado absoluto (LP) también por cierto paralelismo con אלה, indica la libertad de toda esclavitud (vv. 71.74a.75.77); el reducirla sólo a lo espiritual<sup>(32)</sup> sería introducir una dicotomía reductiva y ajena al texto. Por otra parte la mención del *pueblo de Dios* pone de relieve el sentido religioso de una conciencia comunitaria.

A continuación en el VERSO 69 se vincula la *redención* con la *salvación* operada por Dios a través de la familia davídica. Esta segunda razón para la alabanza responde al deseo del Sirácida (51,12h) que invita a alabar a Dios porque hace brotar מצמיה cf. v. 78) el Cuerno para la casa de David. Es difícil saber si el sabio tenía en mente algún hecho concreto cuando provocaba a esta alabanza<sup>(33)</sup>; pero ello puede reflejar sólo el anhelo de que a Dios se le alabe por

<sup>(30)</sup> Lv 25,29 Nm 18,16 Is 63,4 Sl 48,8; 130,4. El verbo פרק encierra en sí los sentidos de dividir, separar, remover, quitar, rescatar, redimir, liberar y salvar. Su presencia se constata en el arameo bíblico, qumránico, targúmico y en el siríaco. En AQ aparece con el sentido de “rescatar” (5/6 Hev A nab 1,10 cp. M.Ket 4,8).

<sup>(31)</sup> El sentido original del biradical פר se hace presente en sus expansiones, sobre todo con פ y ע. Y en este caso se forma un sustantivo asonante y contrastante con פרקא (cp. Is 63,4) que es פרענוא (5/6 Hev Ep 1,2; 14,3 cp. Mq 7,4 P), que se construye también con עבר.

<sup>(32)</sup> W. HENDRIKSEN, *The Gospel of Luke* (Edinburgh 1979) 123.

<sup>(33)</sup> TestLev 18, 2 alude con ἐγείρειν a una dinastía sacerdotal reinante (cf. TestDan 5,20 TestGad 8,1). Las fluctuaciones entre Judá y Leví muestran las diversas tendencias de la literatura intertestamental sobre el mesianismo; cf. M. DE JONGE, “Two Messiahs in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs”, *Tradition and Reinterpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Hom. C.H. Jürgen (ed. J.W. VAN HENTEN) (Leiden 1986) 150-162.

su decisión de salvar a través de la familia de David (2Sam 7,26), pues se espera que ese plan se cumplirá con certeza. Igualmente con el aoristo griego aquí no se necesita aludir a un hecho más concreto que el de la vinculación de la salvación divina a la acción de la Casa de David. Se trata de una profesión de fe que tiene por cierta la promesa de Dios siempre actual y actuante. Por eso al “cuerno” no se le representa realizando nada; simplemente emerge como expresión de la acción de Dios y de su fuerza salvadora. Y si la exaltación mesiánica era parte de la esperanza judía<sup>(34)</sup>, como consta también por la Amidá (15)<sup>(35)</sup> aunque sólo en su recensión babilónica posterior a la palestina<sup>(36)</sup>, esto no prueba que Lc dependa claramente de liturgia concreta<sup>(37)</sup>, pues las formulaciones son diversas y el rito hipotético.

La expresión ἐγείρειν κέρας es hapax. El giro “levantar el cuerno” es normal en el AT Y este “levantar” se expresa con varios verbos según su sentido<sup>(38)</sup>. Pero ἐγείρειν en el AT nunca acompaña a κέρας. Si la frase hubiera sido concebida en griego, el compositor hubiera usado el verbo habitual para este giro que es ὑψοῦν; y si la base hubiera sido hebrea se hubiera compuesto con רים<sup>(39)</sup>, verbo normal para este giro, que lógicamente hubiera sido traducido con ὑψοῦν<sup>(40)</sup>. Como aparece ἐγείρειν es lógico pensar que en la base está el verbo que más le representa en el AT, y éste es קים (21x en LXX)<sup>(41)</sup>. Pero sólo en arameo, que respeta los usos de רים, aparece

<sup>(34)</sup> Cf. vgr. Ps.Fil., *Lib. Ant. Bib.* 2,3.

<sup>(35)</sup> Se denomina Amidá por recitarse “de pie”, también Shemoné Esré (“dieciocho” bendiciones) y Tefilá (“oración” típica); cf. J. BONSRVEN, *Textes Rabiniques* (Roma 1955) 2.

<sup>(36)</sup> G. DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu I* (Leipzig 1930) 303-304. Cf. infra n. 210.

<sup>(37)</sup> F. MANNS, “Une prière juive reprise en Luc 1,68-69”, *EphLiturg* 106 (1992) 162-166. El mismo F. MANNS, *Une approche juive du Nouveau Testament* (Paris 1998) 151-161 afirma también que la no mención del “brote mesiánico” en la Amidá palestinese se debe a una censura de la polémica anticristiana.

<sup>(38)</sup> El giro puede tener un sentido de soberbia cuando es el ser humano quien toma la iniciativa, y se puede construir con נש – ἐπαίρειν (Zc 2,4) o con רים – ὑψοῦν (Sl 75,5). En sentido positivo se usan verbos que tienen que ver con el “brotar” por la identificación del “Cuerno” con el “Germen” davídico (צמח ἀνατέλειν: Ez 29,21; y ἐξανατέλειν: Sl 132,27) o con el salir de un cuerno (ἀναβαίνειν y ἀναφύειν קלך: Dn 7,8 y יצא: Dn 8,9).

<sup>(39)</sup> Amidá 15.

<sup>(40)</sup> 1 Sam 2,1.10 Sl 89,18; 92,11; 112,9; 148,14 Sir 47,5.11 cp. 1 Cr 25,5.

<sup>(41)</sup> La ecuación ἐγείρειν = רים aparece sólo en 1 Sam 2,8: levantar al pobre.

קִים en un mismo contexto con קָרַן. Y se hace para señalar el brote de una dinastía (Dn 7,24) y el surgir del Germen (Ez 29,21 צִמְחָה TM קִים T), denominado קָרַן (TM) pero interpretado פִּרְקָן (T) por la tradicional unión de *cuerno* con *salvación* (2Sam 22,3). El sentido del verbo קִים en arameo es el de instaurar (Dn 2,4) y colocar (Dn 2,21; 11QtgJb 34,24), restablecer (Dn 4,14) y restaurar (1QapGn 20,28). Y el hecho de que קִים – ἐγείρειν se use concretamente para la acción de Dios que suscita un “salvador” (Jc 3,9.15) e instaure jueces en Israel (Jc 2,16.18) sugiere que el primer sentido del ἐγείρειν κέρως aquí apunta al de suscitar una persona, hacerla entrar en la historia salvífica con fuerza.

Y esto se confirma con el sentido de קָרַן a partir de sus diversos matices. La imagen del “cuerno” representa algo que crece y algo que es fuerte. Y ambos sentidos se entremezclan en el AT<sup>(42)</sup>. Aquí el cantor juega a la vez con el ἐγείρειν que es suscitar una persona, con el κέρως que representa una fuerza, y con σωτηρία que la define como salvadora. Pero si ἐγείρειν κέρως es hapax, también lo es en cierto sentido κέρως σωτηρίας. Este binomio en el AT se encuentra sólo una vez y con posesivo (2Sam 22,3||SI 18,3)<sup>(43)</sup>, aplicado a Dios a quien por el paralelismo se le ve como un pico o altura, un lugar de refugio y de invencible defensa que además salva. Y esto en virtud de su “fuerza”, como lo hace notar T al interpretar קָרַן con

(42) El cuerno como realidad es algo que crece y es fuerte, y como imagen se toma de un animal cornudo (SI 92,11; cp. Dn 8,3), que es fuerte (Jb 39,9s). Así su cuerno pasa a ser símbolo de fuerza (Nm 24,8), como luego lo es todo cuerno en general (SI 148,14). De este modo la imagen llega a aplicarse metafóricamente, por la asimilación con el cuerno del animal (SI 92,11), para designar el surgir de la persona (Dn 7,8; 8,9) y para indicar a la misma persona (1Sam 2,11) en cuanto se la ve fuerte (SI 75,11; 92,11; 112,9) o se la desea fuerte (Dn 8,3.7). Consiguientemente el cuerno aparece como imagen de una fuerza que crece (1Sam 2,10). Y esta imagen se transfiere también de las personas al pueblo (SI 75,11; 89,18). La metáfora del cuerno, al incluir en sí el doble aspecto del “surgir” y de la “fuerza” (Zc 2,4), sirve especialmente para indicar el surgir de una descendencia y su fuerza (SI 132,17). Por esto la imagen tiene una aplicación privilegiada en el momento de designar la fuerza de una tribu (Dt 33,17) o una figura mesiánica (Nm 24,8), pues de un golpe se expresa el surgir de la figura y su fuerza (Ez 29,21). No es, pues, extraño que con esta valencia קָרַן haya adquirido un valor titular en el judaísmo; cf. P. BILLERBECK, *Kommentar aus Talmud und Midrasch II* (München 1924) 110-111. Y este valor titular se puede considerar que se encuentra presente de algún modo también aquí; cf. J.A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I* (New York 1981) 383.

(43) Para otros usos del posesivo en el contexto del קָרַן cf. 1Sam 2,1.10 SI 92,11; 112,9 Amidá 15.

פרקן evitando antropomorfismos en Dios; y lo hace paralelo a פֶּרֶקֶן (así aquí P, H) que corresponde al hebreo יָשַׁע<sup>(44)</sup>, raíz ésta rarísima en arameo (4QDn) y considerada hebraísmo<sup>(45)</sup>. Lo que era Dios para David ahora se dice con un giro singular que eso queda definitivamente fijado en su familia para todo el pueblo<sup>(46)</sup>: *para nosotros en la Casa de David*. Y se le define a este David como *siervo* de Dios con el calificativo de παῖς, término que raramente significa “hijo” en LXX (Pr 4,1; 20,7 Qo 4,13) y que 340x traduce עֶבֶד, vertido también 327x por δοῦλος<sup>(47)</sup>.

El verso siguiente, el VERSO 70, apela a una locución divina, que permanece como testimonio del gesto de Dios y garantía de su fidelidad aun en el tiempo en que no aparecieran profetas<sup>(48)</sup>. La oración del καθώς empalma lo precedente con lo siguiente; concluye lo anterior, pero sobre todo abre a lo siguiente, pues en ella se encuentra el único verbo en tiempo finito de los vv. 70-72. La locución a la que aquí se alude testimonia el gesto salvífico de Dios en la casa de David (v. 69), pero al mismo tiempo define su naturaleza liberadora (v. 71) que está conectada con la alianza patriarcal (v. 72). El hecho de la locución se puede expresar en arameo con אָמַר (Dn 6,21) al que corresponde más λέγω (cf. 4QEn 6,4; 9,1; 22,14), o con מִלֵּל; este último verbo como típicamente arameo toma cuerpo sobre todo cuando le corresponde su asonante λαλεῖν (Dn 7,8 Jb 8,2; 4QEn 14,2); y en sus usos entra también la locución divina (TNLv 1,1). Tras él se podría vislumbrar una alusión a los oráculos sobre David (1Sam 7,12) y sobre el descendiente mesiánico<sup>(49)</sup>, pero conectados también con la alianza patriarcal (v. 72). Filológicamente no ofrece dificultad el modo de señalar aquí la

<sup>(44)</sup> Para la traducción aquí de “salvación” por “vida” (S cp. LP) cf. v. 77.

<sup>(45)</sup> S.F. FASSBERG, “Hebraisms in the Aramaic Documents”, *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (ed. T. MURAOKA) (Louvain 1992) 76.

<sup>(46)</sup> Lo que era dar fuerza al ungido (1Sam 2,10), suscitar una descendencia a David (Sl 132,17), dar fuerza al pueblo (Sl 148,14), dar fuerza y dinastía a la Casa de Israel (Ez 29,21), dar fuerza a David para dar fuerza al pueblo (Si 47,11.5) se convierte ahora en “suscitar una fuerza de salvación para nosotros en la Casa de David”.

<sup>(47)</sup> Ambos epítetos se aplican a David en LXX: παῖς (1Cr 17,4 Sl 18,1 Is 37,35), δοῦλος (1Re 8,66; 11,13 Sl 89,4; 1Mac 4,30).

<sup>(48)</sup> E. SCHWEIZER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen 1982) 28. Para la referencia bíblica a la época sin profetas cf. Sl 74,9; 77,9 Ez 7,26; 1Mac 9,27.

<sup>(49)</sup> Cf. vgr. Is 4,2; 11,1 Jr 23,5-6 33,15 Ez 29,21 Zc 3,8; 6,12.

mediación de la palabra de Dios: si se puede expresar con el giro idiomático “por mano de” (2Re 21,10 Zc 7,7.12 Sb 11,2), “por boca de” (S, P) es más reciente (2Cr 36,21s) y en el NT se encuentra siempre en boca de palestinos (He 1,16; 3,18.21; 4,25). H combina ambas expresiones al poner: “por mano (medio) de la boca”.

Sin embargo la frase total en griego no es diáfana. Decir que Dios habló “desde antiguo por boca de sus santos profetas” es algo fácil de concebir y de expresar. Pero el texto griego no lo dice así. La lectura preferida por la crítica contiene el que Dios habló por boca τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (p<sup>4</sup> B vg). El que se trata de un texto poco claro lo prueban las variantes textuales. La dificultad para la fácil comprensión de esta frase no depende de la simple elegancia de un hipébaton griego<sup>(50)</sup>, que por lo demás no es tal y viene perfeccionada por otros códices (N W y Eus) que escriben τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν. La dificultad nace porque el grecista se ha encontrado con un texto base al que trata de ser fiel; un texto al que todos sus traductores al hebreo lo modifican para hacerlo comprensible, como lo han intentado también otros códices griegos y versiones siríacas (S, P) al decir que Dios habló por boca ἁγίων προφητῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀπ’αἰῶνος (D it). Una tradición textual más amplia (occidental Θ, alejandrina C, bizantina A) escribe diciendo que Dios habló por boca τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ’αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ, identificando “los profetas” con “los santos” y dejando abierto el interrogante sobre quiénes son estos santos.

El término “santo” como calificativo es normal, y no extraña verlo aplicado a personas. Por eso se encuentra también el giro “santo profeta”, probablemente acuñado en Palestina, pues a principios de la era cristiana se aplica a Moisés en Egipto (Sb 11,1)<sup>(51)</sup> y tras la destrucción del templo a los profetas en Babilonia (2Ba 85,1)<sup>(52)</sup>. Su origen puede estar en la santificación profética (Jr 1,5) y en el hecho de que a los profetas se les denomina “siervos” de Dios (2Re 17,13.23 Am 3,7 Jr 7,25), precisamente en conexión con la locución divina (1Re 21,10 cp. Sb 11,1); y en este título se unen también Moisés y los profetas (1QS 1,3 cp. CD 5,21–6,1; 2,12). Pero aquí el término “santo” no es un adjetivo, sino que funciona como sustantivo. Así lo sugiere la mayoría de los códices griegos que leen: Dios *habló por*

<sup>(50)</sup> J.C. HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae* (Oxford 1909) 50.

<sup>(51)</sup> D. WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (New York 1982) 23.

<sup>(52)</sup> R.H. CHARLES, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* II (Oxford 1913) 475, 524 n. LXXXV.



*boca de los santos, (los) desde siempre profetas suyos.* Y así lo hace aquí también H. En estas lecturas “santos” es un apuesto a “profetas”, de forma que ambos términos se encuentran en paralelo<sup>(53)</sup>.

Entonces ¿quiénes son estos “santos”, a quienes se les denomina “profetas”? No unos santos innominados, sino aquellos a quienes la tradición los define como “(los) santos” por antonomasia y los ve ejercitando una función profética de comunicar el mensaje de Dios. Estos podrían ser los ángeles. Una amplia gama literaria aramea en la época del NT se refiere a ellos con el adjetivo sustantivado de “santos”<sup>(54)</sup>, y este lenguaje se conserva en Palestina aun en el s. VII d.C.<sup>(55)</sup>. Ellos aparecen en la Biblia como presencia locucional de Dios, sobre todo “antaño” en las narraciones patriarcales (Gn 16,7-9; 18,1; 19,1-3; 21,17; 31,11); y de una de estas figuras brota la promesa de la alianza con su aspecto de victoria sobre los enemigos (Gn 22,15-17), que inmediatamente se hará notar aquí. Ellos hablan<sup>(56)</sup> y actúan como profetas de los profetas clarificando el mensaje divino (Zc 2,1-6,7 Dn 8,17; 10,11-12). Y así aparecen también en la literatura intertestamental, de forma que la misma historiografía salvífica se adscribe a su intervención (Jub 1,27; 2,1; 22,21). Y sobre todo intervienen en la comunicación de la voluntad de Dios en el Sinaí a donde Dios baja con sus ángeles (Dt 32,2 TM y T; Sl 67,18); según unas tradiciones palestinas por medio de ellos dió la Torah<sup>(57)</sup> e incluso sus explicaciones (CtR 1,2). Era doctrina común que Dios habló por ellos (Heb 2,2; cp. 1,1), de forma que Fl. Josefo pudo confesar el haber aprendido “lo más noble de nuestras doctrinas y lo más santo de nuestras leyes δι’ ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ”<sup>(58)</sup>. Y al mismo “profeta” se le denomina “ángel” -

<sup>(53)</sup> A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel according to S. Luke* (Edinburgh 1913) 20.

<sup>(54)</sup> Dn 4,14.20; 1QapGn 2,1.14; 4QTestLev 34,22; 4QMess 18; 4Q 221, 430; 4QEn 1,2; 22,6; 4QEnGi 4,5; 6,4 cf. et. 1En 12,2; 14,23; 47,8; 60,4; 61,10.12; 106,19 Tb 8,15. Cp. 1QS 11,8; 1QM 1,16; 3,5; 10,12; 12,1.4.7; 1QH 3,22; 4,25; 1QSb 3,26. No consta que en Qumrán se dé el calificativo sustantivado de “santos” sino a los “ángeles”; cf. J.S. COLLINS, “In the likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran”, *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. D. PARRY – E. ULRICH) (Leiden 1999) 613-614.

<sup>(55)</sup> BEYER, *Texte* I, 474; II, 239.

<sup>(56)</sup> Cf. et. Jc 6,11; 13,1-25; 2Sam 11,20; 2Re 1,3-4 Tb 5,4.

<sup>(57)</sup> He 7,38.53 Gl 3,19 PesiqR 21 (103b) citando rabinos del 150 d.C.

<sup>(58)</sup> Fl.Jos., *Ant.* XV, 136. Cf. et. Fil., *De Somn.* 1,22. Quizás por polémica anticristiana se evita posteriormente en el rabinismo el mencionar ángeles en el Sinaí; cf. Shab 88b.

mensajero, pues como los ángeles aconseja y habla de parte de Dios<sup>(59)</sup>. También en el NT se mantiene la figura angélica como transmisora de la palabra de Dios<sup>(60)</sup>. No sería, pues, extraño que aquí con el título de “santos” se estuviera aludiendo a los ángeles.

Si una presencia de “santos” en estado absoluto arameo (4QEn 106,19) podría bastar al griego para entenderlo en un contexto específico como determinado (1En 106,19!?), de una traducción fielmente servil al arameo del texto griego preferido aquí por la crítica emerge claramente el sentido determinado y sustantivado de “los santos” identificados luego con “sus profetas”. En arameo el adjetivo que acompaña a un sustantivo determinado, aquí por el posesivo, habrá de ir normalmente en estado enfático; pero el adjetivo se coloca tras el sustantivo (T1Sm 12,22). Si aparece por delante (cf. LP) es que no se trata de un simple adjetivo, sino de un sustantivado. El griego habrá traducido literalmente con el artículo determinado el enfático del adjetivo que por su posición emerge como sustantivo (“los santos”), al que corresponde en aposición otro sustantivo (“sus profetas”) en una oración predicativa poéticamente construida sin relativo e iniciada con el “desde siempre” (cp. Dn 2,44; 4QEn 9,4).

Los “santos”-ángeles son precisamente los “profetas” más antiguos de Dios, los que lo son “de antaño”, como se los designa con ἀπ’αἰῶνος indicando desde cuándo ejercitan su función profética (cp. Gn 6,4): “desde siempre” y “para siempre” (LP), lo que señala que son los mensajeros habituales (Jr 28,8). El ἀπ’αἰῶνος, un giro que en el NT se encuentra sólo en boca del palestino Pedro (He 3, 21) y de Santiago como cita (He 15,16), no se puede entender simplemente como señalando “los antiguos” (הַרְאִשִּׁים) con que se designa a los profetas clásicos (Zc 1,4; 7,7.12). Si se quisiera expresar esto, el griego hubiera sido τῶν ἐμπροσθεν para quien se adhiere al vocabulario de LXX (en aram. קִדְמָא), o τῶν ἀρχαίων en el vocabulario lucano (Lc 9,8.19 cp. He 15,7.21). Pero el griego ἀπ’αἰῶνος traduce 20x al hebreo מֵעוֹלָם (aram. עֲלַמָּא) que nunca corresponde a un vocablo griego con la sílaba – πο – , ni al adjetivo ἀρχαῖος y que siempre alude a un “desde cuándo” con referencia a un tiempo lejano por indeterminado y desconocido en sus detalles

<sup>(59)</sup> Mt 2,7s; 2Cr 36,15-17 Sl 151,4 LXX: ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ = נְבִיאָא 11QPs<sup>a</sup> 151 LvR 1,1.

<sup>(60)</sup> Mt 1,24; 2,13 Lc 1,13,30; 2,10; 22,43 Jn 12,29 He 5,19; 8,26;10,22; 12,8; 23,9 y Ap *passim*.

(Jr 25,5 cf. Sl 77,6): desde la eternidad (Dn 2,20), desde que tiene existencia la misma alianza (Sl 14,17; cf. Jr 7,7).

Una de las características de la alianza proclamada por el ángel del Señor era la victoria sobre los enemigos (Gn 22,17). Ahora en el VERSO 71 se aclara cuál es el sentido de la σωτηρία (v. 69), instaurada en la casa de David (v. 70) y vista como λύτρωσις (v. 68): es una “liberación” de enemigos. Esto está en línea con el sentido del arameo פִּרְק. Un eco de esta idea se puede encontrar en el Sl 106,10, que aquí se recoge con rasgos peculiares. Mientras TM y LXX usan en el salmo dos verbos diferentes para significar la salvación (יָשַׁע – σώζειν, גָּאֹל – λυτροῦν), aquí se emplea sólo un sustantivo: σωτηρία, siempre obra de Dios. Si en TM los dos sustantivos (אֵיִיב – שְׁנֵאָה) representan un colectivo, LXX traduce uno en plural (μισοσύντων) y el otro en singular (ἐχθροῦ), mientras en este himno se colocan ambos en plural para dar sensación de cantidad. Y mientras TM y LXX usan dos veces la expresión “por mano de”, el cantor aquí lo hace sólo en la segunda parte y recalca la universalidad añadiendo “todos”. Además, separándose de TM y LXX, inserta los pronombres personales plurales, que no sólo contribuyen a la rima del verso, sino que le manifiestan al cantor como miembro de una comunidad perseguida. Curiosamente las principales diferencias de este himno con respecto a TM y LXX en el Salmo coinciden con la expansión explicativa de T al término “cuerno de salvación” (cf. v. 68) en 2Sam 22,3: el sustantivo, los dos plurales indicando a los adversarios y la expresión de universalidad. El pronombre personal en T es singular en boca de David, mientras en el himno es plural; pero este plural responde también a la introducción de T (v. 1) que aplica la liberación no sólo a David (TM) sino a todo Israel (cp. SlSal 10,9). Como no se puede pensar que a nivel literario ninguno de los dos escritos dependa el uno del otro, es lógico suponer que ambos se remontan a una tradición aramea común, que les precede en el modo de comentar el “cuerno de salvación” y donde ambos coinciden.

El tema de la liberación se recoge más adelante en el mismo salmo davídico de 2Sam 22,18||Sl 18,18, donde se menciona en imperfecto la acción de Dios que libra (נָצַל, aram. שָׁיַב) de los “que odian”/“enemigos” violentos (עָו, aram. עֲשֵׂן) y prepotentes (אֲמִיץ, aram. אֲמִיץ). El término בַּעַל־דָּבֵב es el que designa en las versiones siríacas del himno a los enemigos y, aunque no aparezca en Qumrán por la escasa referencia a “enemigos”, es usado también en las otras etapas

del arameo occidental (TODt 32,32 TIs 14,21) en paralelo con “los que odian” (TNEx 15,6); y se conserva además en LP (Mt 5,44). Si la liberación hay que entenderla de todo tipo de hostilidad (4QTestLev 5,1.6) y no se puede restringir a sola la espiritual (v. 77 cp. Ex 20,5), tampoco se pueden hipotizar aquí enemigos concretos a base de presionar sobre el presente griego *μισούντων*, pues el término semítico correspondiente designa al “enemigo” en general tanto en arameo (Dn 4,6; 1QapGn 22,27 MegTaan 26) como en hebreo (Gn 24,60 Pr 25,11) sobre todo en poesía (Sl 18,18; 21,9 etc), aunque naturalmente conlleva una nota de enemistad real (Ex 1,10 Lv 16,17 Ez 16,27). Y Dios libra de “todos y cada uno” (según el sentido de כָּל cuando acompaña a un nombre determinado).

El hecho de que en griego desde el v. 71 al 75 no haya ningún verbo principal hace que la sintaxis griega sea anómala y que los conceptos vayan avanzando como a golpes<sup>(61)</sup>. Para obviar esto y en línea con las expresiones véterotestamentarias (Sl 18,18; 106,10) P convierte el sustantivo “salvación” en un imperfecto final como intención del oráculo divino: “para librarnos” (לְפָדֵנוּ), mientras S manteniendo su tradicional concepto de “vida” para “salvación” (cf. v. 77) introduce el verbo פָּדַע en afel (cp. 4QDn 2,21; 11QtgJb 40,8) poniendo de relieve a Dios como causa de la salvación de un sujeto plural (“nosotros”) al traducir: “y nos hizo libres para la vida”; de este modo S redondea cuatro estrofas (vv. 68, 69, 70, 71) con verbos finitos. El tema de la salvación liberadora, frecuente en el AT, tiene su analogado principal en el Exodo (Jc 6,9; 1 Sam 10,18), paradigma de toda liberación (Is 42,20; 52,12), y está especialmente vinculado a David (2 Sam 7,23; 1 Cr 17,8 Is 37,35) y a su descendencia (Sl 72,4 Jr 23,6); pero se encuentra también enraizado en la alianza patriarcal (Gn 22,17) como se recuerda a continuación, en línea además con un himno de Qumrán: “Bendito el Dios de Israel que mantiene su fidelidad amorosa (חֶסֶד) para su alianza y pruebas de salvación para el pueblo de su liberación” (1QM 14,5).

El VERSO 72 contiene dos infinitivos (ποιῆσαι ἔλεος y μνησθῆναι διαθήκης) que tienen sentido final (o *gerundivo*): la acción liberadora de Dios tiene lugar actualizando o para realizar el amor de la alianza. Así interpretan S y LP el infinitivo (H) como futuro final, y también la Vulgata: *ad faciendam misericordiam cum patribus nostris*. Pero esto no ha de entenderse como que Dios se

(61) J. NOLAND, *Luke 1–9:20* (Dallas 1989) 87.

“compadece de los padres”, como lo entiende P al traducir el infinitivo con un perfecto (“obró misericordia”), pues no se trata simplemente de una acción de Dios en el pasado sino de las repercusiones presentes de la historia salvífica. El verbo ποιεῖν hay que entenderlo como “realizar” hoy, y todo su complemento es ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων: la *misericordia* (que tuvo) *con nuestros padres*.

En LXX ποιεῖν ἔλεος es frecuentísimo y traduce עשה חסד de TM (Gn 24,12; 2Sam 2,6 Rt 1,8), rara vez עשה צדקה (Ex 18,19.21) y חן (Jc 29,21). Al verbo עשה corresponde el arameo עבר usado aquí por las versiones siríacas. El término חסד con sentido positivo funciona como hebraísmo en el arameo, donde esa raíz indica más bien algo “ignominioso”. Un equivalente de חסד, חן (Nm 11,15 Jc 6,17), usado aquí por S y P, en arameo es raro y tardío (TNEx 12,36). El sustantivo más similar a חסד en el concepto es רחמים (Is 63,7 Jr 42,12), siempre plural, que se encuentra en el arameo bíblico (Dn 2,18), en el qumránico (11QtgJb 42,10) y en el bizantino (TNDt 7,8). Sin embargo las fuentes arameas no acostumbran a configurar este giro uniendo עבר con רחמים (LP, H) sino con שב, como aparece en Qumrán (1QapGn 19,19; 21,3), en el Targum<sup>(62)</sup>, y en el arameo bizantino (Taan 32a GnR 942,3). En el NT este giro sólo se encuentra en boca de palestinos (St 2,13), y con artículo aparece en Lc (10,37) como hapax (2Sam 2,5 cp. 2Cr 24,22), y corresponde al enfático del AQ (1QapGn 19,19); el término ἔλεος, abundante en los himnos lucanos (2 y 2) y frecuente como concepto en la literatura palestina, se repite en Lc (1,58) sólo en boca de palestinos y está ausente de He. Si ἔλεος hace alusión a la misericordia y חסד al “amor fiel”, el arameo שב se conecta sobre todo con la bondad de Dios (Os 3,5)<sup>(63)</sup>, revelación de su gloria (Ex 33,18-19) y de su ser definido como רחום y חנון, lleno de חסד (Ex 34,5); así aparece como la raíz de su compasión (Sl 25,7), y expresión de su salvación (Zc 9,17) y de todos sus dones (Jr 31,12 Sl 27,13 Neh 9,25.35).

Aquí se está queriendo decir que Dios con su salvación actualiza la bondad que inició con los patriarcas. La promesa a los padres se hace realidad en los hijos (CD 1,4)<sup>(64)</sup>, entre los que se cuenta el

(62) TOGn 24,12.24 TOEx 20,6 TONm 14,8 TODt 5,10 TNGn 24,49 T1Sm 20,8.14 TJr 32,18.

(63) Una acertada traducción del giro es “faire bonté”; Cf. L. PANIER, *La naissance du fils de Dieu. Sémiotique et théologie discursive. Lecture de Luc 1-2* (Paris 1991) 218.

(64) J. ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg 1977) 96.

poeta. No se trata, pues, de una actuación de Dios “junto con” (!?) los padres<sup>(65)</sup>. Por otra parte la correspondencia del μετά con un arameo ܡܗ hay que considerarla perfecta como lo evidencian aquí las versiones siríacas y LP (“con nosotros”), a pesar de que lo niegue Resch<sup>(66)</sup> apelando a que este μετά viene traducido en Lc 10,37 como ܥܠ por LP, que por cierto está siguiendo a S y P. Pero lo que hacen estas versiones es cambiar el giro, y no hablan ya de “obrar misericordia con” (ܡܗ H) sino de “compadecerse (v. 33) de”; y el verbo “compadecerse” (ܡܚܝܠ) se construye habitualmente con ܥܠ. Además LP (y H) en Lc 1,38 traducen el μετά de este giro con ܡܗ, mientras S y P lo explican con ܕܝܢܐ. Y el ܡܗ, que es muy del genio arameo<sup>(67)</sup>, se mantiene para este giro en T y P (Gn 24,18; 40,11; 47,29 etc), cuando LXX o lo traduce con μετά (2Sam 2,6) o con dativo (Gn 24,14), ya que el giro hebreo admite también ל (Ex 40,6; 34,7). Más aún, T llega a cambiar el ܥܠ de TM por ܡܗ como mayor clarificación para el arameo (1Sam 20,8; 2Sam 3,8). Y la forma a emplear aquí es la típica ܡܗܝܢܐ (TOGn 19,19; 23,13). El giro aparece también con ܡܗ en Qumrán (1QapGn 19,19; 21,3).

Si en el primer hemistiquio del v. 72 se ve a ἔλεος actualizándose en la σωτηρία, en el segundo hemistiquio se presenta a la διαθήκη como la raíz de la actuación de Dios (Sl 106,45), lo que muestra la centralidad de este concepto<sup>(68)</sup>. Si ἔλεος se une tradicionalmente con διαθήκη en el AT (Dt 7,9; 1Re 8,23), aparece también en unión con σωτηρία (Tb 6,18) y εἰρήνη (Tb 7,12), conceptos ambos presentes en este cántico (vv. 71.79).

El giro μνησθῆναι διαθήκης es hapax. Si se tratara de reflejar un giro de LXX habría que atenerse a τοῦ μνησθῆναι διαθήκην (Gn 9,16). Por otra parte también en hebreo el infinitivo לִיכֹר es raro (Ez 23,19), y un giro similar pero discutido (כִּזְכֹּר) es también hapax (Jr 17,2). Por eso, aunque H es fiel aquí al infinitivo, S pone el verbo en pasado (כִּזְכַּרְתִּי), como también P usando aquí el verbo

<sup>(65)</sup> W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin 1978) 72.

<sup>(66)</sup> A. RESCH, *Das Kindheitsevangeliem* (Leipzig 1897) 42.

<sup>(67)</sup> Es la partícula con la que se indica incluso toda la posesión de la persona; cf. pap. 5/6 Hev A nab 1,11. De hecho equivale al dativo entendido como “con relación a”; cf. E. MARTÍNEZ BOROBIO, *Gramática del arameo antiguo* (Barcelona 1996) 111.

<sup>(68)</sup> J.S. CROATTO, “El ‘Benedictus’ como memoria de la alianza. Estructura y teología de Lucas 1,68-79”, *RevBib* 47 (1985) 215.

tipicamente siríaco ܒܪܝܬ. Todo esto indica que se trata de un giro singular.

Si se traduce literalmente  $\mu\eta\eta\sigma\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\varsigma$  siguiendo a Gn 9,16 (לזכר ברית) se puede construir el arameo קים לדוכרן (TO), donde דוכרן es un sustantivo que no desentonaría aquí, pues el infinitivo griego del himno equivale a un sustantivo<sup>(69)</sup>. En el texto del Génesis el infinitivo-sustantivo se refiere al arco iris, que recuerda la alianza de Dios con la humanidad en Noé. En la misma dirección, aquí la salvación realizada actúa como “recuerdo” o “memorial” perenne (דכרונא: Esd 6,2), anámnesis de la alianza de Dios con los patriarcas. Este “memorial” representa más que un ejercicio meramente cognoscitivo; las acciones actuales de Dios son la continuación de su acción salvífica en el pasado<sup>(70)</sup>, actualización del pacto que se concreta en la salvación con la liberación de los enemigos (1QM 17,7-9).

Si se pretende en arameo una fidelidad literal al infinitivo griego, la forma correspondiente podría construirse en qal (למדכרה: TNGn 40,14: “recordar”) o en itpeel (אדכרה כ TJr 17,2: “acordarse”); pero es mejor verla en afel ya que así aparece en T traduciendo el giro correspondiente del TM (ולאדכרה Ez 23,19 “actualizar el recuerdo”) e indica una realidad presente que hace recordar, provoca el recuerdo de una actuación pasada. Esta forma verbal es la que ha dado lugar además a la forma sustantivada אדכרתא registrada también en el s. I d.C. en Palestina<sup>(71)</sup> y que indica el “memorial” (TNLv 24,7 TNNm 5,26). El sentido de memorial es, pues, el reflejado por el infinitivo; y no el hecho de que Dios realiza un gesto para acordarse él de su alianza, lo que no sería muy lógico (cf. Lv 26,42 Sb 18,22). Ni tampoco parece propio dar al infinitivo aquí un matiz de gerundivo, pues para este matiz sirve el participio correspondiente que se registra en TM (Gn 41,9 Ez 21,18; 29,11) y en LXX (Ex 32,13 Est 4,8) y aparece aplicado al mismo Dios (Sl 115,12LXX). Aquí se trata de poner de relieve que Dios con su acción salvífica en Israel está provocando el recuerdo de su alianza (1Cr 16,15 Sl 111,14)<sup>(72)</sup>.

Pero también Dios se acuerda de su alianza con los patriarcas

<sup>(69)</sup> F. BOVON, *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc* 1–9 (Genève 1991) 106.

<sup>(70)</sup> J.B. GREEN, *The Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge 1997) 117.

<sup>(71)</sup> MegTaán 16; cf. et. דוכרן en BEYER, *Texte* I, 222:6,8; 388: ggJR 1; 400: ssJA 1.

<sup>(72)</sup> En la misma línea se mueven Sl 135,13; 145,7 Ex 12,14; 13,9 cp. Sl 106,8 Qo 1,11.

(SI 105,8). Y esto está en la raíz de su gesto salvador en el Exodo (Ex 2,24). Además el recuerdo de su bondad para con David es el que dinamiza también las subsiguientes acciones salvíficas (2Cr 6,42). De este modo la alianza con los padres se continúa en la descendencia davídica. Y así aparecen unidas las figuras de Abraham y David<sup>(73)</sup>. El término que en la Peshitta del AT y en el Targum – cuando no parafrasea (TODt 4,23) – corresponde a ברית (TM) διαθήκη (LXX) es קים en sus diversas grafías<sup>(74)</sup>. Sólo cuando más tarde en la cultura aramea (LP) y siríaca (S, P, H) se introduce con fuerza el término griego se constata su transliteración como דייתקי o con el cambio de la ā a la ē en el arameo targúmico como דייתקי, en paralelismo con מרב (TJII Gn 24,10). El término קים encierra en sí el matiz de algo real, firme, estable, una ordenación válida, un decreto obligatorio y un compromiso vinculante. La misma raíz ha podido señalar el establecimiento de la fuerza de salvación en la casa de David (v. 69) y aparece en el hebreo qumránico para aludir al pacto eterno de Dios (CD 3,13; 4,9 cf. Gn 9,16).

Aquí la alianza viene definida como *santa*. Se ha aludido ya a la santidad al mencionar a los transmisores de la palabra de Dios (v. 70). La referencia a la santidad es frecuente en la literatura aramea de esta época (Dn 11,22.28.30)<sup>(75)</sup>. Pero a pesar de que al término *alianza* le pueden acompañar diversos epítetos (Gn 9,16 Nm 10,13 Jr 31,30), como aparece también en Qumrán<sup>(76)</sup>, sólo se presentaba un paralelo a la unión de διαθήκη con ἅγια: 1 Mac 1,15.63. A éste hay que añadirle ahora 1QSb 1,2 que contiene la forma ברית קדש de trasfondo véterotestamentario (Jr 51,10 SI 98, 1). El giro se podría construir aquí en arameo siguiendo al hebreo: sustantivo + sustantivo + pronombre (Jr 51,10 cf. TNNm 11,25); o en línea con S y P: sustantivo + pronombre + adjetivo. Y en el sonido de la primera vocal de קדש hay que hacer prevalecer el arameo ū (TOEx 29,29) sobre el hebraizante ō (TJIIEx 40,10). Respecto al concepto mismo conviene señalar que la alianza santa es la que hace de quienes participan en ella un pueblo santo, es decir, “el pueblo de los santos de la alianza” (1QM 10,10), en línea con la concepción

<sup>(73)</sup> R.E. CLEMENTS, *Abraham and David* (London 1967) 47-60.

<sup>(74)</sup> Cf. vgr. Dn 6,8.16; 11QtgJb 40,28 TOGn 9,16 TOEx 24,8 TODt 4,13; 8,18 TJr 31,30 TJIIEx 10,2 cp. 1QH 13,13.

<sup>(75)</sup> BEYER, *Texte I*, 680.

<sup>(76)</sup> 1QpH 2,4; 1QS 1,8; 4,22; 5,5.8; 8,9.16; 1QM 12,3; 17,7 CD 1,4; 6,11; 8,18.21; 12,11; 19,16.31.



véterotestamentaria de que la santidad de Dios determina la santidad del pueblo (Lv 11,44-45; 19,2; 20,26), idea propia también de este cántico (vv. 70.75.77). Es la alianza del Santo (Is 6,3), del trascendente, la que une a él y exige una actuación como la suya (Jr 9,22-23).

En el verso siguiente, el VERSO 73, la alianza viene interpretada como el *juramento que juró a nuestro padre Abraham*, dando a entender que la alianza mencionada aquí no es primariamente la sinaftica (Ex 19,5; 24,8; 34,10), aun renovada (Jr 31,31-32) y vista como juramento eterno (Ez 16,59). Este *juramento* es el vinculado a la alianza patriarcal y al amor fiel de Dios para con los padres. Tal juramento aparece con diversos matices en el AT Pero este cántico no responde exactamente al vocabulario con que el AT se refiere a él<sup>(77)</sup>. A nivel lingüístico, el giro “jurar el juramento” es fuertemente semita<sup>(78)</sup>. En el NT esta expresión aparece con variantes en boca del palestino Pedro (He 2,30), sin que el verbo ὁμνύω, presente en Mt (8x), Mc (2x), Heb (6x), St (1x), Ap (1x), se reproduzca en Lc-He ni en Pablo. La expresión ὁρκον ὃν ὁμοσεύεν (LXX) tiene su correspondencia exacta en TM (Dt 7,8), y en T se expresa con קימא דקיים. La raíz קים, indicada ya para señalar el “erigir” (v. 69) y la alianza (v. 72), es la que usa habitualmente T para referirse al juramento como acción de Dios (TOEx 13,5.11 TONm 14,16.23), al voto (TONm 30,3) y al compromiso humano como pacto (TJos 9,20), mientras prefiere la raíz ימי para indicar el

<sup>(77)</sup> En el AT se habla de alianza con Abraham (Gn 15,7.17; 17,4.7 cp. 11) y de alianza con Abraham, Isaac y Jacob (Ex 2,14 Lv 26,42). Se habla también de juramento a Abraham (Gn 21,16-18) como padre de Isaac (Gn 26,3), del juramento a los padres (Jr 11,5 Dt 7,8.12 cp. 11,9) y a nuestros padres con ἔλεος a Abraham (Mq 7,20) y del juramento a Abraham, Isaac y Jacob (Gn 50,24 Ex 32,13 Dt 9,4). De modo más amplio se menciona el pacto con Abraham, el juramento a Isaac, el precepto a Jacob y la alianza para Israel (1Cr 16,25 Sl 105,8); y se alude a “juramentos a los padres y alianzas” (Sb 12,21; 18,22). El hacer intervenir la cópula entre “alianza” y “juramento”, como aquí lo hace P, implica una cierta distinción entre ambos conceptos, como lo evidencia el AT donde estos términos tan frecuentes casi nunca aparecen juntos en el mismo verso e incluso cuando aparecen media una distinción entre ellos (Dt 31,20; Jc 2,1); rarísima vez se mencionan juntos: con referencia a los Patriarcas (Dt 4,31; 7,12), a Israel (Ez 16,8) o a David (Sl 89,4).

<sup>(78)</sup> KLOSTERMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 27. El giro aquí es ajeno al uso lucano, que prefiere construir las “figuras etimológicas” con dativo más que con acusativo; cf. L. Díez Merino, “Trasfondo semítico de Lucas 1-2”, *EstBi* 50 (1992) 57.

juramento humano<sup>(79)</sup>. Esta distinción entre juramento religioso y humano es propia del targumista judío interesado en no mezclar ambos planos; pero el Targum samaritano usa para el juramento divino también la raíz ימי (cf. vgr. Gn 50,24), que es la que más propiamente le corresponde en arameo<sup>(80)</sup> y la única que se usa para el juramento – precisamente en boca del cordero apocalíptico – en el AQ (4QEn 89,35 cp. 6,4), donde la raíz קים no aparece nunca vinculada al juramento. Por otra parte el uso de שבע en el arameo targumico se puede considerar como un hebraísmo, ya que no existe con ese sentido ni en AQ ni en siríaco. En el AQ es también la raíz ימי la que en qal da origen al sustantivo מומה (1QapGn 20,30) para indicar el acto de quien jura (TONm 5,21 Ned 37a), mientras T del afel derivará מומה (cp. LP) para indicar la obligación que establece el juramento (TJIIDt 27,15-16). El término נה-נה-נה es también el que usan aquí las versiones siríacas siguiendo el uso de P en el AT (Gn 26,3 Dt 7,8).

A nivel conceptual el juramento es paralelo a la alianza (EpBarn 14,1), aunque la alianza se une más con el amor y el juramento con la promesa. Pero a nivel filológico el texto griego presenta una anomalía, pues hace depender del verbo μνησθῆναι a la vez un genitivo (δι' αὐτῆς) y un acusativo (ὄρκον). Y aunque μνησθῆναι se puede construir con genitivo (Sl 137,1; 2Mac 1,2) y con acusativo (Gn 9,16 Ex 20,6), es anómalo regir al mismo tiempo ambos casos. Si *juramento* se considera en aposición a *alianza*<sup>(81)</sup>, lo normal sería poner ambos complementos en griego en el mismo caso. El acusativo ὄρκον aquí sólo se puede explicar en griego como un apuesto al excesivamente lejano σωτηρίαν o como una atracción inversa del antecedente al caso del relativo, construcción también infrecuente (cf. Sl 117,22 LXX). Pero para el conjunto del giro más adecuado sería imaginar en la base un texto arameo (cp. TEz 23,19), al que el grecista se ha aferrado<sup>(82)</sup>. Tanto “alianza” como “juramento” son complementos del “recordar”, que en arameo no se distinguen por casos. El primer complemento se ha construido en griego siguiendo

(79) TOEx 20,7 T1Sm 14,28 TJr 5,2 TNGn 44,8 TSl 139,20.

(80) Esto se muestra en el hecho de que קים se puede usar para el “juramento” y la “alianza”, mientras que sólo con “alianza” se usa גור (heb. כרה) y sólo con “juramento” ימי (heb. שבע).

(81) F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER – R.W. FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago 1991) 295.

(82) A.-J. LAGRANGE, *L'Évangile selon St. Luc* (Paris 1948) 60.

el uso habitual de  $\mu\mu\eta\eta\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , es decir, con genitivo como ocurre en concreto con  $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ <sup>(83)</sup>, mientras al segundo –  $\delta\omicron\rho\kappa\omicron\nu$  – se le ha puesto en el normal acusativo (cp. Jos 9,20). Incluso en el uso del  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  para indicar el beneficiario del juramento se nota una anomalía, pues aunque es posible en griego<sup>(84)</sup> no es éste el uso habitual de LXX, que lo expresa con dativo (cf. et. He 2,30), mientras TM usa  $\text{ܠ}$ . Por fin, al calificar aquí a Abraham, beneficiario del juramento, como *nuestro padre* (Is 51,2) el cantor está indicando que la salvación para los individuos es efecto del amor de Dios para con el pueblo (Sl 106,4) que tiene por padre a Abraham.

La benevolencia-alianza-juramento de Dios con los padres implicaba un don y una promesa. A este don hace referencia ahora el poeta. Pero lo expresa con fórmulas totalmente originales, no presentes en ningún otro texto. En el AT el don a Abraham implicaba fundamentalmente la descendencia y la tierra como promesa (Gn 13,15-16; 26,4-6; 28,13-14)<sup>(85)</sup>. Ahora el don se concreta en la libertad y en la adoración; y los beneficiarios son los hijos, *nosotros*. Sin embargo, tanto la libertad como la adoración estaban ya presentes en los contenidos del don-promesa dentro de la alianza-juramento. La libertad, en el hecho de que la descendencia de Abraham vencería a sus enemigos (Gn 22,17; cp. 14,20; 15,13-14) y también en la liberación de toda esclavitud (Dt 6,19; 9,3) como consecuencia de la promesa hecha a los padres (Ex 2,23-24; 3,6-8; 18,4.10). Y la adoración, porque a la descendencia de Abraham se la ve como espiritualmente conectada con Dios (Gn 17,7 cp. 19), la liberación tiende al servicio divino (Ex 4,23; 5,1; 15,13.17), y el don de la tierra tiene por fin la perfecta fidelidad a Dios (Sl 105,44-46 Dt 8,10). Por eso, aunque la tierra no ha sido dada por la justicia de los hijos (Dt 7,7-8) sino por la de Abraham (Gn 26,5), en ella hay que practicar la justicia (Dt 11,8-9.20-22; 16,20; 19,9); de lo contrario, pierde su sentido y se pierde (Nm 32,11 Dt 6,14-15; 30,18; 2Re 23,26-27). Todo esto queda remedado también en la alianza davídica (Sl 89), con su nota de liberación (2Sam 22,18||Sl 18,18; 72,12) y de consiguiente falta de miedo (Jr 23,4 Is 11,1; 29,20) en

<sup>(83)</sup> Gn 9,15 Ex 2,24; 6,5 Lv 26,41.45 Ez 16,20; 1Mac 4,10; 2Mac 1,2 cp. Am 1,9.

<sup>(84)</sup> Hom., *Od.* 14,331; 19,288.

<sup>(85)</sup> Cf. et. Gn 35,11-13 Ex 32,13. Es muy frecuente la vinculación del don de la tierra a los padres: Lv 26,42 Nm 11,12; 14,23 Dt 1,8; 26,3.15; 31,7; 34,4 Jos 1,6; 1Cr 16,15-19 = Sl 105,8-16.

orden a ser de Dios (2Sam 7,20.24 Is 53,5-6). De este modo se combina aquí la alianza patriarcal con la sinaítica y su justicia, y también con la davídica y su descendencia victoriosa. Esto denota una comprensión del valor divino en la historia.

Con la mención del don se inicia un nuevo verso<sup>(86)</sup>, el VERSO 74. Así lo indica la misma Vulgata, pues es además propio del cántico el que cada frase encierre un único contenido<sup>(87)</sup>. Pero el griego de esta frase es chocante<sup>(88)</sup>: el dativo ἡμῖν como beneficiario del δοῦναι se asocia al acusativo ῥυσθέντας como sujeto del λατρεύειν con referencia al mismo grupo de personas. Este giro no se equipara a otros del NT aunque revista cierto paralelo con ellos (vgr. Mt 18,8 Lc 8,10 He 4,29; 26,20 Ef 1,18), ni la dificultad se aclara apelando a un texto oscuro de Eurípides (Med 814). Aquí el participio iría mejor en dativo<sup>(89)</sup>, y la oración subordinada quedaría más clara si hubiera sido introducida con ἵνα (He 8,19), aunque la construcción con participio es también griega<sup>(90)</sup>, pero no hebrea, por lo que todos los traductores del Benedictus al hebreo aquí modifican el texto. La frase se puede entender perfectamente en arameo donde no ocurre esta colisión de casos y donde el participio “liberados” (TIs 35,9-10) puede actuar como calificativo de “nosotros” indicando un estado; y además en arameo se puede pensar en una oración nominal completiva en la que el sujeto sobreentendido sea el beneficiario “nosotros” (cf. infra n. 126) y el participio actúe como predicado.

Otro modo de entender el giro es viendo que en arameo el ܠ ante “nosotros” puede indicar también el acusativo – giro típico en arameo – y señalar así al sujeto a quien afecta la acción del δοῦναι = ܠܗ, entendido como “hacer” (cf. Dt 28,7 TM y LXX); de este modo el hemistiquio vendrá a significar: “para hacernos impávidos liberados de la mano de enemigos”<sup>(91)</sup>. Y esto, “en orden a servirle...”. La gracia de Dios crea personalidades libres (cf. Jn 8,36

<sup>(86)</sup> Así NESTLE-ALAND, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (26 ed., 1988).

<sup>(87)</sup> ZORELL, *Psalmendichtung*, 56.

<sup>(88)</sup> J.M. CREED, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London 1957) 26.

<sup>(89)</sup> I.H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids 1978) 92.

<sup>(90)</sup> M. ZERWICK, *Analysis Philologica Novi Testamenti Graeci* (Roma 1960) 132.

<sup>(91)</sup> H. GUNKEL, “Die Lieder in der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu bei Lukas”, *Festangabe A. von Harnack* (Tübingen 1921) 50; CH.C. TORREY, “Outcroppings of the Jewish Messianic Hope”, *Studies in Early Christianity* (ed. Sh.J. CASE) (New York 1928) 300; H. SAHLIN, *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk. Studien zur Protolukanischen Theologie* (Uppsala 1945) 291.

Gl 5,1 Rm 6,15), con una libertad que tiene como finalidad esencial la trascendencia. El verbo ܠܚܢ con sentido de constituir a alguien en una situación está atestiguado en arameo (TOGn 17,5 TODt 28,13 TJr 1,5), y en concreto también con un plural como aquí (TMI 2,9 cf. et. Tab 2). El ἀφόβως (cf. ܡܦܚܕ de Pr 1,33), hapax en Lc-He, al estar en posición enfática define a la persona como *impávida* una vez liberada, y se la puede presentar directamente como objeto del verbo (sin ܐ)<sup>(92)</sup>. Es además normal en arameo que el resultado del verbo principal se pueda señalar con el participio (Mt 19,14P; cp. Gn 21,9P Jn 18,9S), que indica un estado general y se usa con frecuencia en poesía con función de atributo predicativo. Aquí el participio es ῥυσθέντας y en arameo puede equivaler a una forma finita (cf. ܡܝ Jb 26,25 11QtgJb 28,2) incluso gramaticalmente. Es así como S (y LP) entiende este giro como efecto de la acción de Dios y coordina los verbos del resultado (ܠܠܗܘܐ y ܠܠܗܘܐ) mientras P subraya aún más la doble acción como obra del Señor, al hacer intervenir entre ambos verbos la conjunción copulativa; H por su parte se quiere mantener literalmente fiel al griego, pero da a la oración participial un sentido modal (ܠܠܗܘܐ). Hay que notar por lo demás que el tema de la liberación es muy propio de la literatura sálmica (vgr. Sl 3,8; 138,7), donde aparece como objeto de petición a Dios<sup>(93)</sup>, a quien se le aclama como “fuerza de salvación” (Sl 140,8).

Aquí a la salvación se la especifica como una liberación ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν. El señalar a los enemigos con el plural en vez del singular (Sl 106,10 cp. LXX) puede depender del v. 71 o de que el cantor habla en nombre de su pueblo. Al simple plural ἐχθρῶν (A B) algunos códices le añaden el posesivo ἡμῶν (D) concretado con el artículo τῶν (A, C), adiciones que pueden depender del v. 71 u omisiones que pueden haber ocurrido por homoioteleutón. El sentido, sin embargo, no varía teniendo en cuenta sobre todo que en arameo el correspondiente estado enfático de ܠܠܗܘܐ puede incluir el sentido del posesivo<sup>(94)</sup> y viene a significar “nuestros enemigos” con referencia al plural del locutor implícito.

<sup>(92)</sup> R.A. AYTOUN, “The Ten Lukan Hymns of the Nativity in their original language”, *JTS* 18 (1916/17) 283.

<sup>(93)</sup> Cf. vgr. Sl 140,2-5.9-11; 142,7-8; 143,12-14; 144,10.

<sup>(94)</sup> Wm.B. STEVENSON, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic* (Oxford 1962) 22-23.

El término entrevisto aquí para “enemigos” se deriva de la raíz “odiar” (v. 71), y es el que señala a los enemigos en el arameo de la época intertestamental (Dn 4,6; 1QapGn 22,17), con preferencia al que luego se hará más común בעל־יֶדְבֵּב (TONm 22,21 TNGn 21,17 TJIIEEx 15,6), que es el usado aquí por las versiones siríacas. En el himno esta forma larga podría quizás recargar el ritmo poético<sup>(95)</sup>. La liberación (ρύεσθαι) de los enemigos, que se espera de Dios (Sl 7,2; 71,2 Ba 4,21) y por lo que se le alaba (3Mc 7,23), está adecuadamente representada de nuevo por el verbo פָּרַק<sup>(96)</sup>, mejor que por פָּצַי o פָּצַיָּב que no se usan en participio pasivo; y פָּרַק además encierra en arameo un sentido de liberación religiosa (Dn 4,20), conectada con la remisión de los pecados (cf. v. 77b) y que aquí desemboca en el culto, pues la liberación física abre a la espiritual<sup>(97)</sup>. Por otra parte la configuración espiritual del pueblo como finalidad de la liberación no sólo es contenido de la enseñanza véterotestamentaria, ya señalada, sino que aparece también en Qumrán (1QM 14,6; 1QH 2,35-36). Aquí se subraya además que la purificación del pecado tiende a un fin, que viene visto como el servicio a Dios (1QH 1,32-33; 11,9-13). Este servicio se define ahora como adoración y se puede considerar como la finalidad de toda la obra salvífica<sup>(98)</sup>, que conlleva una nota de paz (v. 79) en contraste con el miedo.

La adoración se señala aquí con el verbo λατρεύειν, concepto muy propio en boca de un sacerdote como Zacarías (Esd 7,19.24). Con respecto a este verbo hay que notar que es frecuente en la tradición del Exodo (vgr. Ex 3,12), pero no en el Salterio; y hace referencia sobre todo a una postura moral (Dt 10,12) precisamente ante el Dios de la alianza (Dt 11,13). Esto mueve a interpretar el λατρεύειν en el sentido de una dirección teocéntrica de la existencia, que se realiza ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη, con lo que se inicia el notado como VERSO 75. Estos dos sustantivos están dependiendo de un único ἐν inicial, giro también arameo (Dn 3,13.21; 1QapGn 20,33). Y ambos términos en su complementariedad sirven para expresar la interior relación religiosa del ser humano: con Dios y

<sup>(95)</sup> El otro término para designar “enemigo” en arameo (שׂטן/שׂט) es hebraísmo tardío.

<sup>(96)</sup> TONm 10,9 TODt 15,15 TNEEx 6,6 TNDt 5,15; 16,3; 26,8; 29,24 TJIIEEx 40,12.

<sup>(97)</sup> W. WIEFEL, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin 1958) 64.

<sup>(98)</sup> K.H. RENGSTORF, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen 1958) 34.

con el prójimo (Fil., Abr. 208). Ambos aparecen también juntos en Sb 9,3 (cf. et. 1Te 2,10 Ef 4,24 etc). Y tal tipo de binomios se usa para expresar la postura fundamental del pueblo de Dios (Jos 24,14 Zc 8,8), sobre todo la presagiada para la época mesiánica (Sl 72,7 Jr 4,2) por la acción del germen davídico (Is 9,2 Jr 23,5) y en imitación del mismo Dios (Os 2,21 Jr 9,23).

La equivalencia de *δικαιοσύνη* con la raíz צדק, concepto que encierra toda la religiosidad de la alianza (Gn 18,19), es obvia como aparece en LXX; y es la usada aquí por S, P, H, LP. Este término está atestiguado en el arameo bíblico, y precisamente en cuanto vinculado a la liberación del pecado (Dn 4,24). Y se encuentra también en el AQ. Por la gran variedad que encierran los usos de esta raíz, que puede aludir incluso a la limosna<sup>(99)</sup>, no es extraño que equivalga en arameo también a זכו (Dn 6,23 TOGn 18,19; Sl 18,21.15 cp. 11QtgJb 25,5), como lo hace habitualmente el Targum a los Profetas con su matiz de “pureza”, aspecto reconocido también por LXX<sup>(100)</sup>. Con el arameo קשט (TIs 48,1 TZc 8,8) se designa la *δικαιοσύνη* en el Libro de Enoc (cf. et. Jos 24,14), y es el concepto clave de la religiosidad mandea<sup>(101)</sup>.

Al configurarse el binomio cuando *δικαιοσύνη* corresponde a צדק, a *ὁσιότης* corresponde ישר (Dt 9,5 cp. 32,4), raíz que en otras partes acompaña también al término de “justicia” (Pr 1,3; 7,9). La raíz ישר indica una “rectitud” y por eso εὐθύτης (Dn 6,23) en el binomio puede sustituir a *ὁσιότης* (Jos 24,14) o a *δικαιοσύνη* (1Re 9,4). A la raíz ישר puede corresponder en arameo, cuando lo pide el contexto, la raíz כון que indica “estabilidad” y “firmeza” (TIs 26,7; 33,15); y es la usada aquí por S y P para traducir “santidad”, mientras H prefiere כוןܡܠܟܐ con resonancias de entrega confiada. Pero la raíz כון está muy poco atestiguada en el arameo cercano a la época neotestamentaria. Y por otra parte la raíz קשט, que puede traducir ישר (TIs 4,4; 45,19 TMI 2,6) sobre todo en el TO (cf. vgr. Dt 9,5; 32,4), tiene más bien el sentido de veracidad. Por eso es más propio con LP ver tras *ὁσιότης* a ישרותא (Dt 9,5 Sam cp. TNGn 35,9) que en el AQ expresa la ausencia de doblez, está unida al concepto de “pureza”

<sup>(99)</sup> F. ZORELL, *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum Veteris Testamenti* (Roma 1965) 682-684. Para “limosna” como צדקה en arameo cf. A. MEYER, *Jesu Muttersprache* (Leipzig 1896) 107.

<sup>(100)</sup> MURAOKA, *Index*, 124.

<sup>(101)</sup> M. LIDZBARSKI, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer* (Giessen 1915) XXII y 3.

y aparece como herencia de los Patriarcas (4QQah 1,9.12 cf. AQ 537,5.1).

La postura de “santidad y justicia” como postura de la “adoración” se realiza “ante Dios” (cp. Jn 4,23), expresión que en arameo acompaña a ܐܠܗܐ (Dn 6,23). El término equivalente a ἐνώπιον en arameo es ܩܕܡܐ (Dn 2,9; 5,13.15), que LXX traduce también como ἐναντίον (Dn 6,23) o ἔμπροσθεν (Dn 6,10). La preferencia aquí por el ἐνώπιον puede deberse a que es la partícula que mejor expresa la postura de servicio (1 Sam 2,18) y las actitudes que la acompañan (1 Re 3,6); y además, con excepción de Mt y Mc, se encuentra en todo el NT pero sobre todo en Lc-He (35x) y proporcionalmente con más frecuencia en Ap (32x).

El verso concluye con una alusión a la permanencia en esta postura: πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν en dativo (p<sup>4</sup> B L), mientras el acusativo (⌘ A C D) refleja el uso de LXX (Jr 35[42],8), donde se añade también la mención “de la vida” (Is 38,20) presente aquí en S y en algunos códices griegos (Γ Θ). La fórmula se puede considerar de algún modo conclusiva (Sl 23,6 cp. 93,5; 128,5 cf. et. TestLev 43,1), pues al salmista le gusta terminar con un “siempre” (Sl 16,11; 18,51; 30,13; 61,9) que sin embargo puede encontrarse también en posición medial (Sl 27,4; 90,14). Por eso el giro aquí no hay que entenderlo como un final rígido y absoluto, sino como un ápice<sup>(102)</sup>, pues la dinámica continúa.

El VERSO 76 representa una inserción en el himno, como lo hace notar la partícula δέ<sup>(103)</sup> que aquí tiene sentido de “también” (cf. LP). El giro καὶ + x + δέ corresponde al arameo ܕܐܝܚܐ (Dn 6,23), y empalma lo siguiente con lo anterior (2Cr 11,5 Sl 89,28). Esto precluye el considerar lo que viene como un himno oracular desconexo de la eucología precedente. Este modo de hacer la inserción aparece sobre todo en la época tardía del AT<sup>(104)</sup>, y en la tradición lucana se constata en boca de palestinos (Lc 2,35 He 3,24). Y este tipo de inserción repentina no es extraño a la poética semítica (cf. vgr. AsMos 10,8). La inserción tiene aquí la forma de un oráculo en segunda persona singular, que interrumpe la dinámica del himno

<sup>(102)</sup> S. FARRIS, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives* (Sheffield 1985) 138. Pero este giro, por la ausencia del ἐν con el dativo, hay que considerarlo ajeno al estilo habitual de Lucas; cf. Díez MERINO, “Trasfondo semítico”, 57.

<sup>(103)</sup> A. VANHOYE, “L'Intérêt de Luc pour la prophétie”, *The Four Gospels II*, Hom. F. Neirynck (eds. F. VAN SEGBROECK et al.) (Leuven 1992) 1530.

<sup>(104)</sup> 1Cr 9,38 cf. et. 8,32 Neh 2,18; 13,15 Jb 19,4.



en tercera persona; pero esta alusión a la persona, a quien se le habla dirigiéndose a ella con el pronombre que de suyo está incluido en el verbo, es un modo también del AQ para acentuar el énfasis<sup>(105)</sup>. Aquí al sujeto a quien se dirige el oráculo se le denomina *παιδίον*, término con que se alude a un niño recién nacido (Gn 17,12; 21,8 Jc 14,21 Is 9,6). Y el dirigirse a la persona con el calificativo es un modo arameo de sustituir solemnemente al nombre<sup>(106)</sup>. Las versiones siríacas traducen el sustantivo como ܪܝܬܐ, pero este vocablo en el AQ se usa para sujetos en edad juvenil (4QEnGi 7,7 etc), como aparece también en el NT (Mc 5,4) y se constata ampliamente en el arameo posterior<sup>(107)</sup>. Por eso es mejor ver aquí tras el *παιδίον* el arameo ܐܠܝܡ, que designa al hijo (4QEn 107,2) e incluso al recién nacido (1QapGn 2,2; 4QEn 106,18), aunque el término se pueda aplicar también a los jóvenes (4QTb<sup>a</sup> 7,2; 11QgtJb 29,8; 33,25 TOGn48,16).

Al niño se le divisa ahora como profeta. Una figura profética era ya esperada en aquella época<sup>(108)</sup> a partir de una interpretación del AT (Dt 18,18 Mq 3,1.13), donde aparece presente también la función profética junto a la fuerza mesiánica (Ez 29,21). La presencia de ambas figuras es además típica de Qumrán<sup>(109)</sup>. En este himno al profeta se le inserta en medio de dos menciones mesiánicas (vv. 69.78). Y mientras el profeta “prepara”, el mesías “salva”. Pero estas dos funciones no son meramente sucesivas, sino que están entrelazadas y coordinadas entre sí de forma que la supresión de este

(105) BEYER, *Texte I*, 518.

(106) G. DALMAN, *Jesus-Jeschua* (Leipzig 1922) 184-185.

(107) A. SOKOLOF, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan 1990) 225.

(108) 1 Mac 4,41-46; 14,41; 1QTest 4,1-8 Mt 16,14 cp. 1QS 9,11 TestDan 9,2 Fil., *Spec. Leg.* 1,65 Fl. Jos., *Ant.* 20,97-169 BJ 2,261.

(109) Una figura es la del Maestro de Justicia, que aparece como un intérprete del profetismo (1QpHab 7,4-5), provoca la conversión (1QpHab 8,2-3) y guía según la mente del Señor (CD 1,11); por ello le toca sufrir (1QpHab 5,10-11; 9,9-10; 11,5). Tras el profeta viene la función mesiánica (1QS 9,11), el Mesías (CD 20,1) esperado (1QSa 2,12) y conectado con lo sacerdotal y lo laico en Israel (CD 12,23 cp. 1,7; 2,12); aparece como destructor del mal (CD 19,10 cp. 1QM 11,7) y juez (1QpHab 5,4), pero en su tiempo se da también la remisión de los pecados (CD 14,19). Al Maestro de Justicia se ha intentado darle un nombre propio, pero aún no se ha logrado; cf. G.R. DRIVER, *The Judaean Scrolls* (Oxford 1965) 126-167; E. PUECH, “Le grand prêtre Simon (III) fils d’Onias III le Maître de Justice?”, *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*. Festschrift H. Stegemann (eds. B. KOLLMANN et al.) (Berlin 1999) 158.

verso destruiría notablemente la dinámica del himno. El profeta es una figura relacional, y se la define como προφήτης ὑψίστου, expresión que no se encuentra en el AT. Un compositor deseoso de atenerse al vocabulario bíblico lo hubiera denominado προφήτης(τοῦ) κυρίου (1Re 22,7; 2Cr 28,4) como se le define a Elías (1Re 18,22; 2Re 3,11) y a Samuel (Sir 46,13), o προφήτης (τοῦ) θεοῦ como se usa para Eliseo (2Re 5,3 LXX) y Jeremías (2Mac 15,14). El título προφήτης ὑψίστου responde al vocabulario de un área determinada, la Palestina del s. I, donde este título se aplica a una figura mesiánica sacerdotal (TestLev 8,15), quizás identificable con un jefe macabeo como Juan Hircano, de reconocidas dotes proféticas (Fl. Jos., BJ 1,2.8)<sup>(110)</sup>. Por otra parte, la referencia a Dios como “altísimo” que en el AT aparece con matices característicos<sup>(111)</sup> es muy propia del AQ donde עֶלְיוֹן subsiste como hebraísmo (Dn 5,18; 4QDn 5,6; 12,4; 10x en 1QapGn), recogido también por la tradición lucana en la expresión “hijo del altísimo” (Lc 1,32; cp. 35) tomada del AQ (4Q246). Las versiones siríacas más primitivas (S y P) traducen “altísimo” con ܐܠܗܐ, mientras posteriormente se usa ܐܠܗܐ ܥܠܝܝܢ (H), raíz presente también en LP.

La función profética es un augurio, un deseo para el futuro del niño<sup>(112)</sup> a quien se le quiere ver especialmente conectado con el Señor. Con el verbo κληθήσῃ se señala la realidad propia de la persona (Lc 1,60) y su futura misión (Jn 1,42 Mt 16,18 cp. 1Jn 3,1), como lo indica su uso en el AT<sup>(113)</sup>. La equivalencia de este verbo se puede hacer con מָרַם o con מָרַם; pero en el AQ el itpeel imperfecto, que es la forma que corresponde a este giro, se usa más con מָרַם, empleado también aquí por S, P, H, LP.

En el hemistiquio siguiente se especifica la postura de este profeta con dos verbos: caminar y preparar. El uso del verbo compuesto προπορεύεσθαι en vez del simple (1Cr 21,30; 2Cr 7,17) apunta a un buen grecista; pero original, pues tal verbo en el NT sólo se encuentra aquí y en una cita literal del AT en boca de Esteban (He 7,40 cf. Ex 31,1.23 LXX). Lc-He mantiene una notable

<sup>(110)</sup> CHARLES, *Apocrypha* II, 309.

<sup>(111)</sup> D. JONES, “The Background and Character of the Lukan Psalms”, *JTS* NS 19 (1968) 35.

<sup>(112)</sup> W. SCHMITHALS, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Zürich 1980) 34.

<sup>(113)</sup> Gn 17,5; 35,10 Is 1,26; 9,6 cp. Is 7,14 Mt 1,23 Is 56,7 Mt 21,13 Os 2,1 Rm 9,26. Para el matiz de este tipo de imperfecto, cf. A. GIANTO, “Mood and Modality in Classical Hebrew”, *IsOrSt* 18 (1998) 187.

preferencia por el simple πορεύεσθαι (88x cp. Mt 28x), y cuando usa el compuesto se inclina por προέρχεσθαι (23x cp. Mt 53x). La forma verbal empleada aquí tampoco aparece nunca en LXX. Y el hecho de que προπορεύεσθαι nunca se construya en LXX con ἐνώπιον hace del grecista de este himno una persona independiente del vocabulario de LXX.

El *caminar ante* Dios corresponde al giro hebreo הָלַךְ לִפְנֵי que se expresa en arameo con הָלַךְ קֳדָם. Y significa actuar de un modo perfecto (Gn 17,1), cumpliendo la voluntad del Señor (1 Re 2,4; 3,6; 2En 9,1). Es un equivalente al λατρεύειν del verso anterior (v. 75) al que acompañaban disposiciones de “santidad y justicia”, como a este caminar acompañan disposiciones de “fidelidad y justicia” (1 Re 3,6). Es así como lo ha entendido también T cuando el caminar ante Dios lo interpreta con el verbo de la adoración פָּלַח (TOGn 17,1), mientras LXX que en sentido ético traduce literalmente el giro como πορεύεσθαι ἐνώπιον (1 Re 2,4), cuando quiere evitar el antropomorfismo lo interpreta como εὐαρεστέιν ἐναντίον (Gn 17,1 LXX cp. 5,22). Por su parte S, P, H, LP traducen el verbo aquí con ܐܘܠ, que en arameo para algunas de sus formas y en concreto para el futuro viene completado con las de הָלַךְ (הָלַךְ). Precisamente en el documento de un miembro de familia sacerdotal que habitaba a 5 km. de Jerusalén en el 64 d.C. se encuentra la forma que se intuye tras este giro: ܠܗܠܝܚ ܩܕܡܐ (Mur 20 ar 7).

La expresión, sin embargo, es ambigua, pues puede significar “caminar ante” Dios en el sentido ético indicado o “caminar por delante” como precursor. Esta ambigüedad la aprovecha el grecista del himno y acuña una expresión hapax: προπορεύεσθαι que alude al precursor, y ἐνώπιον que apunta a la postura ética (cp. Lc 1,17); pues προπορεύεσθαι como “caminar por delante” (Ex 17,5; 33,14 Dt 20,4) se construye con πρότερος (Dt 1,30), ἐναντίον (Jos 6,13) o πρὸ προσώπου (Ex 32,34 Dt 1,30; 9,3; 31,3). Por esta razón algunos códices griegos en vez del ἐνώπιον (p<sup>4</sup> 8 B) han preferido el πρὸ προσώπου (A, C, D), como hubiera preferido un estilo típicamente lucano (Lc 9,52; 10,1) en línea también con la tradición sinóptica (Mc 1,2 Mt 11,10 Lc 7,27). Pero el himno sigue dando trazas de originalidad. Al ver al profeta caminar ante (ἐνώπιον) el Señor como fiel a su vocación, le insinúa también como preparador (προ) del Señor. Esto aparece aún más claro en H que utiliza dos verbos para estos conceptos: “avanzar” y “caminar ante” el Señor. Aquí este κύριος, ante el que camina el precursor, es el ὑψιστος de quien es profeta y

el κύριος Dios de Israel (v. 68)<sup>(114)</sup>. Es el mismo Dios de quien por obra de la descendencia de Leví y Judá ya en el s. II a.C. se esperaba que apareciera como salvador entre los hombres (TestLev 2,11)<sup>(115)</sup>. Es el Dios que según el AT tiene un precursor (Ml 3,1). Jesús lo tendrá de hecho en Juan Bautista según la presentación cristiana (Mc 1,2 Mt 11,10 Lc 7,27)<sup>(116)</sup>, donde además se verá al Bautista identificado con Elías el precursor esperado (Ml 3,23 TM)<sup>(117)</sup>.

La función de este profeta en el himno está definida como la de ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδούς αὐτοῦ, los del Señor. Esto no corresponde exactamente a la misión del precursor según el AT ni en la formulación del TM ni en la de LXX, sea porque en el himno falta לפני (TM) – πρὸ προσώπου (LXX) definiendo el camino sea porque el verbo פנה (TM) se interpreta (LXX) con ἐπιβλέψεται (Nm 10,33 Dt 1,33 cp. 1Sam 13,17-18); ni corresponde tampoco a la tradición sinóptica que presenta al precursor como quien κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν ἔμπροσθεν (Mt 11,10 Lc 7,27 cp. Mc 1,2), y menos a la función que le adscribe Lc (1,17): ἐτοιμάσαι κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον (cf. Si 49,12 cp. 2Sam 7,24). Con todo el giro que está sin duda parcialmente detrás de la frase del himno es פנה דרך (Ml 3,1), que remeda la llamada más general lanzada a un sujeto plural con פנו דרך יהוה (Is 40,3), recogida por los sectarios de Qumrán (1QS 8,14) y que para los evangelistas resume el contenido de la predicación del Bautista (Mc 1,2 Lc 3,4 Mt 3,3 cp. Jn 1,23). Otra nota típica del himno es que “caminos” se encuentra en plural (cp. Is 40,3 LXX), sin duda de extensión y amplitud.

La preparación de estos caminos en línea con los textos básicos véterotestamentario no indica tanto la disposición de las actuaciones en una conducta recta (הכי: 2Cr 27,6 cp. Sir 2,1; 18,23) cuanto la remoción de obstáculos. De hecho el verbo פנה (Ml 3,1 Is 40,3)

<sup>(114)</sup> G. SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* 1–10 (Gütersloh 1977) 62.

<sup>(115)</sup> Cf. et. TestLev 5,2 TestSim 6,5; 1En 25,3 cp. Is 52,8 Ba 3,38.

<sup>(116)</sup> Ph. VIELHAUER, *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (München 1965) 39-40.

<sup>(117)</sup> La esperanza de la venida del “profeta” Elías se había generalizado en la época neotestamentaria (Sir 48,10; 1En 89,59; 90,31 cf. Mc 8,28; 9,11; 15,35-36 cf. et. 2Re 2,11; 2Cr 21,11 Just., Dial. 8,4). La asimilación a él de Juan Bautista parte de una semejanza en rasgos externos (Mt 3,4 Mc 1,6 cf. 2Re 1,8), y es propia de Mt (11,14; 17,12) y Lc (1,17 cf. 7,26), aunque en algún aspecto es negada por el mismo Juan (Jn 1,21). Pero es el cristianismo quien utiliza la figura de Elías para interpretar la función de Juan y en el cristianismo se ve también iluminada la figura evangélica de Jesús con rasgos de Elías; cf. R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel according to John* I (New York 1966) 48.

significa “dirigir la mirada en una dirección - volverse” y en piel (Ml 3,1 Is 40,3) indica el “remover los obstáculos” (Sof 3,15 Is 57,14 cf. Lv 14,36), y así “aclarar” el camino (Sl 80,10); y sólo en este sentido, “prepararlo” (Is 62,10 cp. Gn 24,31). Las versiones siríacas, que en el AT se encuentran con la raíz ܦܠܐ (Is 40,3; 57,14; 62,10) o cambiada en ܦܠܐ, “aclarar” (Ml 3,1), aquí prefieren (S<P<H) el pael de ܦܠܐ, “hacer buenos” los caminos, presentando un sentido más general de su preparación. Por otra parte el ܦܠܐ de LP, que indica la disponibilidad (Lc 9,22P), pertenece al estadio bizantino (TNGn 24,43 Ket 35a). Tal vez el arameo ܦܠܐ en pail (TIs 40,2 TMI 3,1) con sentido de “preparar” se pueda considerar un hebraísmo<sup>(118)</sup>, pues propiamente significa “remover” (cf. TNGn 24,31 TNLv14,36), y por eso en otras ocasiones se le cambia al afel (TIs 57,14; 62,10) como causativo del sentido básico en qal: “dirigirse” (1QapGn 19,22; 4QTb 13,6); sin embargo, la persistencia de la raíz permite el mantenerlo aquí con el sentido de “quitar obstáculos”, aclarar el camino y así prepararlo. Como variante se podría postular también su paralelo ܦܠܐ (TIs 40,3), que interpreta ܦܠܐ (ἐξουθενε: Jn 1,23) y se encuentra ya en el AQ con el sentido de “apretar” (11QtgJb 2,2); vendría a significar: preparar el camino “apisonándolo” (ܦܠܐ). A nivel conceptual la preparación tiende sin duda a que el camino humano se convierta en el camino del Señor, y sea “su camino” (ܦܠܐ: 11QtgJb 34,27), participando de su misma rectitud (Dn 4,34 cp. 1QEn 91,14,18). Pero el camino que prepara el profeta es propiamente “el del Señor” (Ez 18,25), con lo que se indica que la acción de la venida le pertenece a él; al ser humano, le corresponde la apertura a su acción.

Este v. 76, que está perfectamente enlazado con el precedente (v. 75) y con el siguiente (v. 77), es el único que se puede considerar como una inserción oracular en toda la dinámica del himno<sup>(119)</sup>. Pues los versos que le siguen (77-79) como los que le preceden (68-75) son una alabanza a Dios, a quien se le ve en ambas partes actuando por medio de una figura mesiánica (vv. 69.78). La inserción del profeta está bien entramada en el conjunto, al que divide en dos partes balanceadas por rasgos similares en ambas: la visita de Dios (vv. 68.78), su benevolencia (vv. 72.78), sus dones al pueblo (vv.

(<sup>118</sup>) Cf. Dt 29,17. A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic* IV/B (Leiden 1973) 230.

(<sup>119</sup>) R. BULTMANN, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen 1967) 323.

73.77), su obra salvadora (v. 71) y directora (v. 79), sus efectos en vida de santidad (v. 71) y remisión de pecados (v. 77), en ausencia de miedo (v. 74) y en paz (v. 79). Todo como Berakah a Dios (v. 68). Y de la acción del profeta se dice que tiende a una finalidad: el conocimiento de la salvación. Pero a él le toca preparar los caminos para ese resultado; el que lo opera es el “Dios del conocimiento” (1Sam 2,3), a quien corresponde conceder el conocimiento (Sb 9,17)<sup>(120)</sup> entrelazado con la remisión de los pecados (Jr 31,34)<sup>(121)</sup>, obra exclusiva de Dios (Is 55,7 Sl 103,3; 130,8)<sup>(122)</sup>. El NT ve esta remisión actualizada en Jesús por sus características especiales (Mt 1,21; 9,6pp; 26,28pp etc.), también según la teología lucana<sup>(123)</sup>, pero no como realizada por el Bautista (Lc 3,3 Mc 1,4 cp. He 5,31 Jn 1,29.33)<sup>(124)</sup>.

Interpretando el VERSO 77 ya las versiones siríacas (S y P) entendieron que se trataba de sujetos diversos en ἐτοιμάσαι (el profeta, P: en futuro de 2ª persona) y en τοῦ δοῦναι (el Señor, P: en futuro de 3ª persona; cp. LP: 2ª). Un giro arameo semejante presenta un sujeto diverso en la oración subordinada de aquel de la principal regente (Dn 2,13 cp. 1QM 14,6); y otro giro extraño en griego (He 26,18)<sup>(125)</sup>, pero en boca de un arameo, presenta como sujeto del infinitivo iniciado con τοῦ uno distinto del de la oración precedente también en infinitivo y que se sobreentiende a partir del pronombre personal inmediatamente anterior<sup>(126)</sup>. Así aquí el Señor,

<sup>(120)</sup> La unión del conocimiento con Dios se expresa de diversos modos en el AT y en Qumrán. El es la verdad (Sl 119,151 TM), identificada con la Torah por LXX (cf. Pr 6,23). En su luz se ve la luz (Sl 36,10; 1QS 3,7), y en él está el camino de la inteligencia (Is 40,14). El es la fuente del conocimiento (1QH 10,4; 12,11-12), que enseña el camino de la ciencia y la sabiduría (Sl 25,4), lo muestra (Sl 32,8) y se lo concede a su pueblo (Ba 3,20.23.27.37; 1QS 1,2-3; 10,12.24-25; 11,6.15-17), porque este conocimiento es lo que él desea (Os 6,6 Jr 9,22-23).

<sup>(121)</sup> STEIN, *Luke*, 20-21.

<sup>(122)</sup> P. AUFFRET, “Note sur la structure littéraire du Luc 1,68-79”, *NTS* 24 (1997-98) 252. Parece forzado el decir que como el Mesías concede (!) libertad y luego viene la adoración, así el profeta concede el conocimiento y luego viene el perdón: cf. PLUMMER, *Gospel*, 20. Cp. Jn 1,8.

<sup>(123)</sup> Lc 7,48; 24,47 He 2,38; 10,43; 13,38; 26,18.

<sup>(124)</sup> R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium* I (Freiburg 1977) 79; G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte* I (Freiburg 1980) 396.

<sup>(125)</sup> Como final es hapax en Lc-He (cp. la completiva hapax en He 15,20).

<sup>(126)</sup> R.P. VAN KASTEREN, “Analecta exegetica”, *RB* 3 (1894) 54-56. Típico además de la libertad estilística aramea es la elipse, por la que se da por

de quien son los caminos (v. 76), es también quien concede el conocimiento. Hay que tener en cuenta además que τοῦ δοῦναι no es exactamente paralelo a ἔτοιμάσαι (cp. vv. 73-74.78-79), pues para ello habría de estar sin τοῦ y entre ambos habría de mediar la cópula καί (cp. v. 72)<sup>(127)</sup>. Y aunque no se puede negar que es posible filológicamente entender el griego τοῦ δοῦναι como un final-consecutivo de ἔτοιμάσαι e incluso como explicativo (infinitivo arameo con ܠ) entendiendo en ambos verbos el mismo sujeto, sin embargo la construcción aramea básica permite más fácilmente diferenciar los sujetos y presenta lo que conceptualmente es más correcto: que gracias a la preparación operada por el profeta, Dios como sujeto del τοῦ δοῦναι (v. 73) es el dador del “don” y quien concede la experiencia de la salvación con la remisión de los pecados.

Si el profeta tiene por misión el preparar los caminos del Señor, esto es para que Dios conceda a su pueblo la γνῶσιν σωτηρίας. Este binomio no se encuentra ni en el AT (TM-LXX), ni en la literatura intertestamental, ni en Qumrán, ni en el NT, aunque se le puedan dar algunos paralelos conceptuales<sup>(128)</sup> e incluso verbales como דון דעם (1QH 4,18), רזי פלאך (1QH 13,2), גלא רזין (Dn 2,18-19.28-29.47; 1QH 1,21), γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια (Lc 8,10pp) como don de Dios y objeto de alabanza. Pero a nivel verbal hay que tener en cuenta además que el sustantivo γνῶσις, frecuente en la literatura paulina (23x), sólo reaparece 1x en Lc-He (Lc 11,52); y σωτηρία, que en este canto se menciona 3x (vv. 69.71.77), sólo reaparece 1x en Lc (19,8). Hay que mirar, pues, en otra dirección para buscar el equivalente de este giro. Y lo encontramos en la tradición aramea.

---

supuesto un término fácilmente comprensible; cf. J. RIBERA-FLOTIT, *Gramática del arameo clásico* (Barcelona 1998) 74.

<sup>(127)</sup> A. MERX, *Die vier Kanonischen Evangelien* II,2 (Berlin 1905) 188. La acumulación de infinitivos en esta forma (vv. 72a.b, 73, 74, 76, 77, 79a.b) es exclusiva de este himno.

<sup>(128)</sup> Los paralelismos conceptuales se pueden instituir a partir del AT a base de ver la venida de Dios como fuente de salvación (Dt 4,6 Ba 4,1 Sl 16,12; 59,23 Pr 1,33; 8,32.35) desde la realidad de la alianza (Sl 25,14 Jr 31,34) y sobre todo en la época mesiánica (Hab 2,14 cp. Am 8,11). Para la importancia concedida al conocimiento en la época intertestamental, cf. G.W.E. NICKELSBURG, “The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees and Some Qumranic Documents”, *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E.G. CHAZON – M.E. STONE) (London 1999) 91-119.

En efecto aquí S (y P) traduce el binomio en cuestión como  $\text{ܠܚܝܬܐ ܕܢܝܨܐ}$  identificando “salvación” con “vida” en línea con la dinámica: vida > mantener en vida > curar > salvar. La ecuación de salvación con vida la hace S siempre (cf. vgr. v. 69), aunque no caiga bien con el sentido del contexto (cf. vgr. v. 71). Esta equiparación, más que a una teologización<sup>(129)</sup> explicable en algo puntual, responde a la permanencia en siríaco de un aramaismo occidental<sup>(130)</sup>, que está presente también aquí en LP (cf. et. vgr. Lc 1,47) y en el Diatéssaron (Jn 10,9 cp. Lc 1,47; 10,28) antes que en S, y se reproduce aquí en P (cf. et. vgr. Lc 19,9 Jn 4,22; 5,34) aunque su preferencia vaya por el término habitual en siríaco-arameo para salvación ( $\text{ܦܪܩܐ}$ ), que es el usado siempre por H. Pero la expresión aramea “conocimiento de la vida” ( $\text{ܡܢܪܥܐ ܕܚܝܐ}$ )<sup>(131)</sup>, que se puede traducir al griego como “conocimiento de la salvación” de acuerdo con el uso de traducir  $\text{ܚܝܐ}$  con  $\sigma\omega\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  (Gn 47, 25 Sl 30,3 Pr 5,27 Est 4,11 cp. Lc 9,24 y 17,33), es un término técnico que como tal ha persistido también en el arameo oriental del mandeo bajo la forma de  $\text{ܡܢܪܥܐ ܕܚܝܐ}$  (Manda dḤaiye) y se aplica a la figura principal de la secta. Tal expresión sólo se puede entender como un nombre propio a partir de un giro recibido del arameo occidental, pues el “conocimiento” no se expresa con este término en mandeo e incluso se puede dudar de que los mandeos entendieran el significado de este nombre y de este giro con el que señalaban el conjunto de la enseñanza fundamental de su secta<sup>(132)</sup>. Como término técnico se recibiría ya fijado del arameo occidental. Y a este giro se puede hacer remontar también el  $\text{ܫܠܟܐ ܕܚܝܐ}$  de Qumrán (1QS 2,3 cp. Sl 111,10; 2Cr 30,22).

<sup>(129)</sup> F.C. BURKITT, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe* II (Cambridge 1904) 81-82. Sería tal vez excesivo el afirmar que  $\text{ܚܝܐ}$  en arameo no tiene sentido de “salvar”, pues éste es sólo un causativo de “vivir”.

<sup>(130)</sup> J. JOOSTEN, “West Aramaic elements in the Old Syriac and Peshitta Gospels”, *JBL* 110 (1991) 275. Esto podría confirmarlo el que P en ocasiones sigue esta práctica de S, que S la emplea con “salvación” y no con el término similar de “redención” para el que usa el general siríaco/araméo (cf. v. 68).

<sup>(131)</sup> El término  $\text{ܡܢܪܥܐ}$  es un absoluto (Dn 5,12; 4QEn 14,3), que se puede escribir también  $\text{ܡܪܥܐ}$  (11QtgJb 37,16), cuyo enfático es  $\text{ܡܢܪܥܐ}$  (Dn 2,12; 1QapGn 19,25). El absoluto  $\text{ܚܝܐ}$  (Esd 6,10 TOGn 2,7) representa una forma peculiar y distinta de la normal, formada a partir del constructo; cf. STEVENSON, *Grammar*, 26. Se puede escribir también  $\text{ܚܝܐ}$ ; cf. J.A. FITZMYER – D.J. HARRINGTON, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts* (Roma 1978) 266 A 34,5.

<sup>(132)</sup> LIDZBARSKI, *Johannesbuch*, XVII. Para el origen palestino de la secta cf. G. WIDENGREEN, *Der Mandäismus* (Darmstadt 1982) 8-9, 12-13.



Al conocimiento de la salvación se lo vincula luego con la remisión de los pecados. La alianza juramentada con los patriarcas aparecía ya en el AT como motor para la misericordia de Dios (vv. 72,78) actuando en la remisión de los pecados (Mq 7,18-20 cp. CD 4,9). Y el reconocimiento del pecado abre a la esperanza en la salvación de Dios (Sof 3,12-13 CD 1,8-9). Pero es sobre todo la experiencia del perdón la que produce el conocimiento de Dios prometido para la época de la nueva alianza (Jr 31,34). Y esto es fundamentalmente lo que viene aquí expresado con la preposición *êv* que conecta la experiencia de la salvación de Dios con el perdón de los pecados, haciendo de éste el medio por el que se logra aquella<sup>(133)</sup>. La preposición *êv* mantiene así no sólo un simple sentido asociativo, sino también típicamente instrumental – y por tanto semítico<sup>(134)</sup> – sea que se la vincule con “conocimiento”, o con “salvación”. La preposición *êv* unida a “remisión de los pecados” es hapax en el NT; y por eso se puede hipotizar aquí la presencia de un traductor, que se atiene literalmente a una base semítica. Al correspondiente *ܐܕ* arameo se le podría dar también el sentido de “ad”<sup>(135)</sup>, pues esta partícula en semítico pasa del sentido local al direccional y a la finalidad<sup>(136)</sup>; de este modo se vería en el conocimiento un impulso para la conversión y el consiguiente perdón (He 26,18 cf. 5,31; 11,18 cp. Lc 24,47), en cuyo caso habría que traducir *γνῶσιν σωτηρίας* como “conocimiento salvífico” (cp. Sb 15,3) en línea con *דעת אמת* (|| *משפט צדק* || 1QS 9,17) con sentido de “conocimiento cierto”. Pero el sentido direccional habitualmente se expresa con *ל*; y si hubiera sido reconocido aquí, a pesar de la fluctuación entre *êv* y *εις* en griego<sup>(137)</sup> probablemente se hubiera usado *εις*, presente también en el himno (v. 79) y que acompaña en el NT al *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν*<sup>(138)</sup>.

Este binomio no se conoce en el AT ni en Qumrán, aunque con el verbo *ἀφιέναι* LXX alude al perdón de los pecados<sup>(139)</sup>. Pero esta

<sup>(133)</sup> S.E. FASSBERG, *A Grammar of the Palestinian Targum Fragments from the Cairo Genizah* (Atlanta 1991) n. 156c.

<sup>(134)</sup> A. SCHLATTER, *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Stuttgart 1931) 175.

<sup>(135)</sup> L. PALACIOS, *Grammatica Aramaico-Biblica* (Roma 1959) 114.

<sup>(136)</sup> C. BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* II (Berlin 1913) 237.

<sup>(137)</sup> M. ZERWICK, *Graecitas Biblica* (Roma 1949) 33.

<sup>(138)</sup> Mt 26,28 Mc 1,4||Lc 3,3; 24,47 He 2,38.

<sup>(139)</sup> Cf. vgr. Gn 50,17 Ex 32,32 Lv 4,20 Nm 14,19 Sir 2,11.

ausencia no quiere decir decir que el binomio sea necesariamente cristiano, pues existe la expresión λύσις ἁμαρτιῶν (1En 5,6). Y el binomio parece ser prelucano, ya que se constata en Mc (1,4), reproducido exactamente por Lc (3,3), y aparece en otro contexto independiente de Mt (26,28). Las otras veces que se recoge en la tradición lucana refleja dichos de algún palestino<sup>(140)</sup>.

Diversos verbos, además de ἀφιέναι, se usan en el AT (LXX) para señalar el perdón de los pecados<sup>(141)</sup>. De entre las equivalencias hebreas para ἀφιέναι, la más frecuente es נָשָׂא (Sl 25,18), pero su correspondiente arameo נָשַׁל no se usa con el sentido de perdonar el pecado. Por otra parte el equivalente hebreo סָלַח (Nm 14,19) no existe en arameo (cp. TS1 130,4); y כָּפַר (Is 22,14) no configura en arameo un sustantivo que indique la remisión, sino sólo en la forma de un hapax verbal (TNEx 29,36). Lo mismo ocurre con el arameo שָׁבַק (Dn 4,12.23), que en Qumrán se registra con el sentido de “perdonar” (11QtgJb 42,10; 4QorNab 1,4) y también en T (vgr. TOEx 32,32 TONm 14,19 TODt 29,19); pero no configura un sustantivo sino en siríaco con ܫܒܩܬܐ y en arameo (LP) con una forma verbal tardía y rara como ܫܒܩܬܐ ܚܒܝܢ (TNNm 7,16). Sólo el verbo פָּרַק (Dn 4, 24) al que traduce λυτροῦν (LXX) con sentido de “redimir el pecado” configura el sustantivo פֶּרֶק, que consiguientemente se podrá aplicar a la remisión del pecado. De este modo se unirían en la misma raíz la salvación (v. 71), la liberación (v. 74), la remisión (v. 77) y la λύτρωσις (v. 68)<sup>(142)</sup>; y de este modo también se conecta la liberación de los enemigos externos (v. 74) con la redención de los internos (Ez 37,23 Is 59,20 Jn 8,31-36)<sup>(143)</sup>. El que

<sup>(140)</sup> Lc 24,47 He 2,38; 5,31; 10,43; 13,18.

<sup>(141)</sup> Cf. Ex 34,7 Lv 4,35; 5,5; 30,30 Dt 30,3 Is 38,17 Jb 42,9 Sb 10,1. La forma aramea normal para “pecado” es ܚܡܐ (AQ, S, P, H); el ܫܚܐ (LP: “necedad”) es raro (Qo 7,25 cp. 4QNoah 7,11 THGn 31,28) y eufemístico.

<sup>(142)</sup> Incluso en el NT aparece ὀφειςις ἁμαρτιῶν en paralelismo con ἀπολύτρωσις (Cl 1,14 Ef 1,7). Y la variación de términos griegos de un mismo trasfondo semítico se observa entre ἐξείλετο – ἔσωσεν – ἐῤῥύσατο – ἐλυτρώσατο (Dn 3,58 LXX), donde el último verbo Θ lo cambia por ἐῤῥύσατο, repitiendo el anterior; lo que puede apuntar a una misma base semítica para ambos.

<sup>(143)</sup> F. ROUSSEAU, “Les structures du Benedictus (Luc 1,68-79)”, *NTS* 32 (1986) 274. De la raíz פָּרַק con referencia al perdón de los pecados no se puede dudar; cf. J.J. COLLINS, “New Light on the Book of Daniel from the Dead Sea Scrolls”, *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism*. FS S. van der Woude (eds. F. GARCÍA – ED. NOORT) (Leiden 1998) 184-185. Implica además una acción congrua a la remisión.

a los pecados redimidos se los señale como αὐτῶν (N B) indica la múltiple distribución del pecado en el pueblo, mientras la sustitución por αὐτοῦ (W) señala una referencia al “pueblo” singular, a la “congregación-iglesia” (LP), y el ἡμῶν (A, C) habla de un encontrarse en ese estado el locutor implícito plural.

El verbo פָּרַק con su sentido original de “separar” se abre a diversos matices sobre el a quién se separa (libera) o qué se separa (arroja), y cuál es el instrumento de rescate o alejamiento; y en virtud de qué se produce ese gesto. A todo esto y con referencia a la razón del dejar ir, del alejar los pecados, se alude ahora en el VERSO 78 con la expresión διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν en un verso que aparece deficiente sintácticamente en griego<sup>(144)</sup> y que así delata más la presencia de un traductor fiel que la de un buen poeta helénico. La preposición διὰ, que empalma con el ἐν del hemistiquio anterior y será retomada en el ἐν del siguiente, está adecuadamente representada por כ (P; cp. Dn 4,24)<sup>(145)</sup>, intercambiable también en el sentido de algún modo con כִּי<sup>(146)</sup>. La fuerza motriz en Dios para conceder el perdón de los pecados reside en su benevolencia (Sl 25,6s; 51,3; 1QH 7,30), que está en la base de toda su obra salvífica (v. 72 Mq 7,19s) y de su visita mesiánica. A Dios se le denomina “el Dios del perdón” (Neh 9,17). Este perdón, bajo la forma hebrea de סליחה (Ex 34,9; 1Re 8,10), actualiza su benevolencia y amor tierno (רחמים: Dn 9,9 cp. Sl 86,5 Is 55,7), del que sin embargo no se puede abusar (Si 5,5). En el AT se lo conecta también con el culto (Lv 5,10 Nm 15,25-26) y con la nueva alianza (Jr 33,8 cp. 31,34; 36,3).

Pero el binomio σπλάγχνα ἐλέους no se encuentra ni en el AT ni en el NT. Se halla, sin embargo, en la literatura intertestamental con referencia a una actuación humana compasiva (TestZab 7,3; 8,2); lo que apunta a que el vocabulario de este cántico se halla inserto en el área palestina, en cuya himnografía se pone de relieve la conexión entre la benevolencia de Dios y el perdón<sup>(147)</sup>. Y precisamente en la literatura qumrálica se encuentra este giro bajo la forma de רחמי חסדי (1QS 2,1) intercambiable con חסדי רחמים (1QS

<sup>(144)</sup> L.T. JOHNSON, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville 1991) 47.

<sup>(145)</sup> Para el trasvase de sentidos entre διὰ y ἐν en el NT, cf. A.T. ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of Historical Research* (New York 1914) 583-584, 589-590.

<sup>(146)</sup> Sl 69,14.17 Neh 9,27-28.31; 1QH 7,14.

<sup>(147)</sup> 1QH 6,9; 7,30.35; 9,13-14.34; 10,21; 11,9.30-31 cf. et. CD 2,4.

1,22). Que se trata de un giro popular usado en arameo lo muestra el que una similar alternancia la presentan aquí las versiones siríacas entre  $\text{ܣܠܐ ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  (S cp. LP) y  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ ܣܠܐ}$  (P). Más aún, al tratarse de un giro coloquial – no bíblico – se puede pensar que el siríaco lo ha tomado del arameo occidental, con la sola excepción de cambiar  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  por  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$ , ya que para el siríaco  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  representa habitualmente algo “ignominioso”. Sin embargo,  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  permanece en el arameo palestinese como un biblicismo, incluso en inscripciones del s. V d.C.<sup>(148)</sup>, como lo muestra también su presencia en LP para traducir  $\chi\acute{o}\rho\iota\varsigma$  (Lc 1,28:  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  P), llegando incluso a penetrar en el siríaco<sup>(149)</sup>.

El término  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$ , que como hebraísmo se hace consistente en el arameo palestinese, se mantiene sobre todo en los binomios, donde por el contexto no se le puede atribuir el sentido típicamente arameo de “ignominia” (4QTb<sup>a</sup> 3,10; 4QTestLev 48,6). Así, por ejemplo, si TO (Ex 20,6) traduce  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  (TM) —  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  (LXX) con  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$ , TJII lo hace con  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  y lo hace igualmente cuando TO traduce con  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  (Gn 34,11) el  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  (TM) —  $\chi\acute{o}\rho\iota\varsigma$  (LXX). Pero  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  aparece en el arameo más antiguo cuando está acompañado de términos como  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  (TOGn 39,21) o  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  (TOs 2,21 TZc 7,9). Lógicamente, pues,  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  estará presente en el arameo correspondiente a  $\sigma\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\gamma\chi\nu\alpha \epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ , pues a  $\sigma\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\gamma\chi\nu\alpha$  corresponde  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  (TOs 2,21 TZc 7,9). Este término, a partir de su significación física (Gn 43,14 Jr 42,12) indica la conmoción de las “entrañas” maternas, por lo que aquí H lo traduce literalmente como  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  (cf. Is 63,15); usado metafóricamente puede ir solo (Dn 9,18 Sl 106,46), como va también en AQ asociado a la remisión de los pecados (11QtgJb 42,10); pero con frecuencia va acompañado de una especificación como  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$ , sea que se refiera a las relaciones humanas (Zc 7,9 Dn 1,9) o sobre todo a la acción divina (Is 63,7).

A la “visita” de Dios como consecuencia de su “amor fiel”<sup>(150)</sup> se alude a continuación indicándola con un  $\epsilon\upsilon$  y relativo, al que corresponde el arameo  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  determinando así que la oración no sea sólo subordinada sino coordinada. El verbo que señala la visita lo presentan en futuro S y P (y  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  B cop) y en perfecto H (aoristo  $\text{ܕܝܫܬܐܢܐܢܐ}$  A C D lat). La crítica textual no hace una opción clara por ninguna

<sup>(148)</sup> FITZMYER – HARRINGTON, *Aramaic Texts*, 258 A 13, 4.

<sup>(149)</sup> C. BROCKELMANN, *Lexicon Syriacum* (Göttingen 1928) 245.

<sup>(150)</sup> TestLev 4,4 cp. 16,5 TestJud 23,5 TestAs 7,3.

de las dos lecturas<sup>(151)</sup>. Los exegetas se dividen también en sus preferencias entre el futuro y el aoristo por razones conceptuales. El futuro ἐπισκέπεται, que cuenta con testigos muy antiguos, tendría un peso teológico como más apto para indicar la esperanza mesiánica y el hecho cristiano del porvenir<sup>(152)</sup> en línea con la función del profeta (v. 76); en cambio, el aoristo representaría un concordismo con el ἐπεσκέψατο inicial (v. 68)<sup>(153)</sup>. Por otra parte el aoristo considerado como la lectura más difícil<sup>(154)</sup> apuntaría como perfecto semítico al hecho concreto de que la acción mesiánica de Dios está operante, y como profético a la esperanza de su plena realización. Así lee Ireneo: “conspexit nos”<sup>(155)</sup>. La solución a este dilema no hay que buscarla en el hecho de que un hipotético participio arameo מבקר haya podido dar origen en griego a ambas lecturas divergentes<sup>(156)</sup>. El acento conviene ponerlo en el hecho de que en arameo cualquiera de las dos opciones por caminos diversos puede representar el mismo concepto, como lo muestran textos que describen la misma realidad con el perfecto (Jb 38,30) o con el imperfecto (11QtgJb 31,7). En arameo el perfecto puede indicar ya la certeza de un futuro, mientras el imperfecto puede señalar el hecho de una realidad ya iniciada. Esta fluctuación es consentánea a una época de grandes expectativas mesiánicas (Mc 9,11-12)<sup>(157)</sup>. Aquí se opta por el perfecto, en línea con la lectura mayoritaria del texto

(151) Así lo indica la letra C en K. ALAND (et al.; eds.), *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart 1983) 206, mientras en la ed. de 1993 lo cambian por B en favor del futuro.

(152) L. SABOURIN, *L'Évangile de Luc* (Roma 1985) 84.

(153) D.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart 1971) 132.

(154) M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford 1967) 129.

(155) El que Ireneo en latín tenga como cita “conspexit” (*Ad.Haer.* III, 10.2) y “visitavit” (*Ad.Haer.* V, 17.1) es señal de que los latinos leían ἐπεσκέψατο, y que por tanto el “visitavit” de las versiones latinas no es un mero lapsus de pronunciación por “visitabit”, como pretendía MERX, *Evangelien*, 188.

(156) La hipótesis de que la divergencia se deba a un 1 hebreo que ha sido diversamente interpretado como copulativo o conversivo cambiaría toda la estructura de la frase. Esta hipótesis la considera “violentísima” S. MUÑOZ, *Evangelios*, 165.

(157) Cp. Mt 16,13-14 Jn 1,19-23. Sobre las expectativas mesiánicas en esa época, cf. J.J. COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature* (New York 1995); J. ZIMMERMANN, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran* (Tübingen 1998).

griego y en paralelismo con el inicio del himno. El mismo verbo en ambas partes de este cántico separadas por la inserción del profeta (v. 76) apunta también a la unidad de un poema en el que se canta la realización de la obra salvífica de Dios.

Al sujeto de la visita se le denomina ἀνατολή. El hecho de que ἀνατολή en griego signifique el “salir” de un astro o el “oriente”, mientras el sujeto del “visitar” es siempre una persona, podría hacer pensar que ἀνατολή es un error de traducción y que tras esta forma se esconde un verbo, pues en alguna ocasión ἀνατολή (LXX) parece corresponder a un verbo, sea צָא (Jc 5,31) o נָגַד (Is 60,19), en cuyo caso aquí representaría el participio de uno de estos verbos o de otros como בּוֹא o זָרַח para ver al Dios que viene “saliendo” (ἀνατέλλων – צָמַח – oriens)<sup>(158)</sup> o quizás “brillando”<sup>(159)</sup> desde la altura. Otra posibilidad sería la de colocar ἀνατολή como verbo en perfecto o imperfecto, en cuyo caso el sujeto habría que buscarlo tras ἐπισκέπτειν construido en participio como מְבַרֵךְ, título registrado en Qumrán<sup>(160)</sup> y aplicado a Jesús como ἐπίσκοπος en el NT (1Pe 2,25 cp. Jb 20,29 LXX). Todo esto supondría una extraña coincidencia del traductor con una rareza de LXX. Pero además la fidelidad al texto griego obliga a considerar ἀνατολή como sujeto del ἐπισκέπτειν, que al ser el mismo verbo con que se alude a la acción de Dios al comienzo del himno confiere a ἀνατολή una cierta aureola divina; teniendo en cuenta además que ἀνατολή representa aquí la presencia del Dios que visita, ἀνατολή puede considerarse como el resultado de la misma visita (CD 1,7).

El sustantivo ἀνατολή se deriva del verbo ἀνατέλλειν, que significa “surgir” y en LXX se emplea entre otros usos (cf. et. Lc 12,54 Heb 7,24) para designar la aparición de la luz (Sl 96,11), la salida de las estrellas (Jb 3,9 Is 14,12 cf. 2 Pe 1,19) y del sol (Mq 3,20 Si 26,16). Consiguientemente ἀνατολή significa la “salida” en general, que luego viene concretada como “de la luz” (Sb 16,28), “de la luna” (Is 60,18), y también del sol pero usando siempre el plural de ἀνατολή (cf. vgr. Jos 19,34). Este sustantivo indica además el “oriente” como lugar geográfico. Pero ni “salida” ni “oriente” hacen aquí sentido, pues se requiere una persona como sujeto del “visitar”. Por otra parte, cuando el sentido de “oriente” representa al semítico

<sup>(158)</sup> Dt 33,2 Is 60,1 Ez 23,4; 2 Sam 5,24 cp. 1 Cr 14,15.

<sup>(159)</sup> Sl 18,29 Ez 1,4.13.27-28; 10,4.

<sup>(160)</sup> 1QS 6,12 CD 15,8 etc; cp. Nm 4,16 LXX.

קדם siempre el griego correspondiente va en plural mientras que si traduce a מורח puede presentarse en singular. A מורח corresponde el arameo מרנח (derivado de רנח “aparecer”), que en arameo (qumránico, targúmico, bizantino) siempre significa “oriente”. Por tanto, cuando las versiones siríacas traducen aquí ἀνατολή con ܐܪܡܝܐ (“salida” y “oriente”; S, LP) o ܐܪܡܝܐ (“salida-oriente-aparición”; P, H) están sólo siendo literamente fieles al griego, sin que se pueda atribuir a esos términos un sentido de “claridad” que sólo tardía y traslativamente se puede ver en el siríaco ܐܪܡܝܐ.

El hecho de que el verbo ἀνατέλλειν equivalga al hebreo צמח, con que se designa el “brotar” de una planta (Gn 3,18), ha determinado el que צמח como sustantivo (“brote” de planta – planta), presente también en arameo (11QTgJb 36,27 TNDt 32,2), se traduzca con ἀνατολή<sup>(161)</sup>. Pero este término nunca significa un “astro” en griego, ni existe evidencia suficiente para afirmar que ἀνατολή como “salida” de un astro (siempre mencionado explícitamente) pueda equivaler a “emergente astro” (cuando no se menciona tal astro)<sup>(162)</sup>. Tampoco el verbo צמח significa “brillar”<sup>(163)</sup> (aplicándolo a un astro), ni siquiera en arameo<sup>(164)</sup>. Y no basta para considerar ἀνατολή como astro el ἐπιφᾶναι del verso siguiente, pues tal verbo no significa tampoco “brillar” sino “aparecer” (cp. TZc 3,8; 6,12), como bien lo indican Ireneo<sup>(165)</sup> y la versión armenia.

El interpretar exegéticamente ἀνατολή como astro<sup>(166)</sup> depende de una hermenéutica de tipo midráshico, efectuada en griego y en línea con los Middot (12.17.22-23) de R. Eliezer<sup>(167)</sup>, que combina el (צמח-) ἀνατολή (Zc 6,12 LXX) con el ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον (Nm

<sup>(161)</sup> Zc 3,8; 6,12 Jr 23,5 Ez 16,7; 17,10.

<sup>(162)</sup> La interpretación de ἀνατολή en un único texto como *aufgehende Sonne* se da como meramente hipotética en P. PETERSON, *EIS ΘΕΟΣ* (Göttingen 1926) 238,2.

<sup>(163)</sup> No es prueba en contrario el que LXX traduzca con ἐπιλάμψει el צמח de Is 4,2, pues se trata de un interpretación favorecida por la presencia de כבד (cp. Is 60,1). Por eso no reconoce como equivalentes ambos términos E. HATCH – H.A. REDPATH, *A Concordance to the Septuagint I* (Graz 1954) 524a.

<sup>(164)</sup> Para contrastar J. GNILKA, “Der Hymnus des Zacharias”, *BZ NF* 6 (1962) 229 cf. M. JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim...*, II (New York 1950) 1287. Sólo en siríaco ܐܪܡܝܐ refuerza el sentido de “aparecer claramente”.

<sup>(165)</sup> *Ad.Haer.* III, 10,2; cp. V,17.1.

<sup>(166)</sup> Melitón de Sardes escribía interpretando Lc 1,78: καὶ μόνος ἥλιος ἀνέτειλεν ἀπ'οὐρανοῦ; cf. H. SCHLIER, *ἀνατολή*, *TWNT I*, 355.

<sup>(167)</sup> H.L. STRACK, *Introduction to Talmud and Midrash* (New York 1931) 96-97.

24,17: כוכב כוכב), interpretando el primero a partir del paralelo (sonoro) con el segundo<sup>(168)</sup>. Esta combinación está favorecida por el hecho de que tanto צמח “brote”<sup>(169)</sup> como כוכב “estrella” tienen significación salvífica (TNm 24,7 cp. 22,6), y son susceptibles de una aplicación al Mesías. Pero el que ambos términos se le puedan aplicar no quiere decir que signifiquen lo mismo. De hecho la aplicación del sustantivo צמח depende de su sentido como “vástago” humano, presente en el rabinismo (EstR 2a DtR 26,6); y así se le aplica al Mesías (Is 11,1 CD 1,4), ya que este sentido coincide también de algún modo con el de קרן como “brote” (v. 69; cf. Amidá 15) y con el de נר como “descendencia” (Sl 132,7 cp. LXX)<sup>(170)</sup>. Por este su sentido צמח se puede usar como nombre propio para una persona, y como tal nombre aparece en el arameo de Palestina incluso en el 600 d.C.<sup>(171)</sup>; y es así como se le da al Mesías el sobrenombre de צמח (Zc 6,12 Ber 2,5a). Con este sentido de “brote” mesiánico aparece צמח también en Qumrán (1QFlor 1,11; 1QPatr 3); y este sentido es fuerte en T, pues siempre que en el AT el sustantivo צמח reviste un matiz titular T lo traduce como “Mesías”<sup>(172)</sup>. Hay que notar además que si צמח – “brote” se aplica como nombre propio al Mesías<sup>(173)</sup>, como se le aplican otros nombres en el AT (Zc 3,9 Jr 23,6) y en el rabinismo<sup>(174)</sup>, nunca se le denomina “oriente” ni “estrella”<sup>(175)</sup>; y este último sustantivo sólo metafóricamente se aplica al Mesías<sup>(176)</sup>. Se puede concluir, pues, que ἀνατολή no significa

<sup>(168)</sup> Justino, *Dial.* 100,4; 106,4; 121,2; 126,1. Cf. ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον (TestLev 18,3) = βλάστος (TestJud 24,4).

<sup>(169)</sup> “Pimpollo” lo traduce Fray Luis DE LEÓN en “Los Nombres de Cristo”; cf. *Obras Completas* (Madrid 1944) 405-420.

<sup>(170)</sup> Como ampliación de este concepto puede compararse 1 Re 11,36 (cf. 5,4 2Re 8,19) con Gn 49,10 Nm 21,18 CD 6,7; 1QS 5,27.

<sup>(171)</sup> BEYER, *Texte*, I 379.

<sup>(172)</sup> TIs 4,2 TJr 23,5; 33,14-15 TZc 3,8; 6,12. Para el valor titular de este término en el AT cf. H. RINGGREN, ‘צמח – šāmah’, *TWAT* VI, 1071.

<sup>(173)</sup> Filón denomina ἀνατολή al Logos (*Conf.Ling.* 14).

<sup>(174)</sup> El valor numérico de צמח es 138 como lo es el de מנחם y por la regla 29 de R.ELIEZER, la gematria, Menahem se convierte también en nombre del Mesías (Sahn 98b), a quien se le denomina además נדירא (LmR 1,16; cp. Dn 2,22) y “bar nefely” (Sahn 98a) haciendo un juego entre נפיל (gigante) y νεφέλη, pues ענני aparece como nombre propio (1Cr 3,24) que T interpreta como “el rey mesías que se revelará” (cp. TZc 3,8 TNNm 15,18 Dn 7,13).

<sup>(175)</sup> P. BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München 1922) 64-67 cp. 113.

<sup>(176)</sup> TNm 24,7 cp. 22,16; 4Qtest 13 CD 7,18 TestLev 18,2 TestJud 24,1.



aquí la “salida” de un astro como sustitución de “astro” emergente, sino el “brote-germen-vástago” mesiánico. Esto es lo que dice su trasfondo semítico, y lo confirma el griego<sup>(177)</sup>.

A la comprensión de ἀνατολή como “brote” no se opone el que se le considere ἐξ ὕψους, que por lo demás tampoco se aplicaría mejor a un astro como saliendo o ascendiendo “de la altura”, mientras a la planta se la podría divisar también como capullo colgante. Pero tanto la dificultad como la solución son aquí cuestión de imaginación. Pues el término ἐξ ὕψους aplicado a ἀνατολή indica la *altura* como equivalente al cielo (11QtgJb 25,2) y simboliza el misterio de Dios<sup>(178)</sup>, su trascendencia originante<sup>(179)</sup>, como fuente de la salvación<sup>(180)</sup>. Sin embargo no consta que esta expresión actúe como sustituto del nombre de Dios (181), ni como sinónimo de ὑψιστος (v. 76), tanto menos en arameo donde este adjetivo aparece como עלִיָּא mientras “altura” se construye a partir de la raíz רום. El hebreo correspondiente optaría por la forma larga del sustantivo (מרום), mientras en arameo se usa también רוֹם<sup>(182)</sup> que es la forma empleada aquí por S, P, H, LP. El concepto que se esconde tras esta expresión puede apuntar de algún modo a concepciones como las del Hijo de Hombre conectado con la altura (Dn 7,13) y presentes también en la literatura intertestamental<sup>(183)</sup>, así como a las tradiciones targúmicas acerca del Mesías oculto que se revelará “desde la altura”<sup>(184)</sup> junto con sus explicaciones midráshicas<sup>(185)</sup>.

(177) Cf. et. el uso del plural de ἀντολή con “campo” para designar las “plantas”; H.G. LIDDELL – R. SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon* I (Oxford 1940) 123 sub II; id., *A Supplement* (Oxford 1968) 13b.

(178) Is 30,27 Jb 26,29 cf. 11QtgJb 36,25.

(179) Dt 33,2 Hab 3,3 Zc 14,3-4.9.18.

(180) 2Sam 22,17 Sl 144,7 cp.103,19 Lm 1,3.

(181) BILLERBECK, *Kommentar* II, 123.

(182) TJIIEx 12,42 TNNm 21,6 cp. 4Q 537,42 Dn 4,7.

(183) J.R. DONAHUE, “Recent Studies on the origin of ‘Son of Man’ in the New Testament”, *CBQ* 49 (1986) 485-486.

(184) TP en Ex 12,42, Mss 110 en Ex 15,18; cf. J. LUZARRAGA, *Las tradiciones de la Nube en la Biblia y en el Judaísmo primitivo* (Roma 1973) 203-204. Estas tradiciones se registran también en la literatura intertestamental, donde se dice que Dios “manda su salvación desde la altura ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ μονογενοῦς προφήτου (TestBen 9,2); y se alude a ellas además en el NT (Jn 3,31; 6,42; 8,23 Lc 19,44 He 3,21). Además el verbo visitar > “in-vestigar” implica la postura de arriba abajo.

(185) En el momento determinado por Dios para enviar a su Mesías sucederá que “hará bajar su gloria”, pues está escrito que “toda carne la verá” (Is 40,5);

El último verso del himno, el VERSO 79, muestra la finalidad de la visita de este germen salvífico y por qué se realiza metafóricamente *desde la altura* (v. 78): para ser visto y patentemente contemplado por todos (Sl 144,5 Is 63,18). El verbo ἐπιφάνειν significa “aparecer” (Jr 29,14 Zc 2,11; 2Mac 3,30)<sup>(186)</sup>, y en causativo “mostrar” (Nm 6,25; 3Mc 2,19); no tiene, pues, sentido de “iluminar”<sup>(187)</sup>. Por esto no desdice de un sujeto como “germen” (cf. Sl 80,2b-3a); y por ello no es necesario para explicarlo apelar a la “luz” de una “estrella” (EpJer 61), como lo hace aquí D (y etiop) introduciendo el sustantivo φῶς (cf. Is 9,1; 60,2), que Clemente Alejandrino (Protrep. 11,114.1) lo aplica al “sol” divino. Y por eso también a la tradición siríaca, que presenta ܝܬܪܐ como equivalente de ἐπιφάνειν, hay que considerarla más como una interpretación que como una traducción.

El término ἐπιφάνειν es raro en el NT<sup>(188)</sup>. Cuando en LXX significa “aparecer” se ve que corresponde al nifal de גלה (Gn 35,7 Ez 39,27), cuyo sentido más propio es ἀποκαλύπτειν “revelar”. El arameo גלי es el que se usa en Qumrán para señalar la revelación de la verdad (4QEn 91,14), y con este sentido es frecuente también en el arameo posterior, que lo emplea para la revelación del צמח (TZc 3,8; 6,12 T1Cr 3,24). Pero en el AQ el verbo que mejor representa el sentido de “aparición” es ܝܬܪܐ<sup>(189)</sup>, que se mantiene también posteriormente aunque dando paso a ܝܬܪܐ y eventualmente sustituido por גלי (cp. 1QapGn 21,8 y TNEx 12,42). Por eso aquí se elige ܝܬܪܐ como correspondiente a ἐπιφάνειν (cp. 1QapGn 21,27), y porque en Qumrán se encuentra la misma forma requerida aquí (ܠܐܬܪܐܝܢ)<sup>(190)</sup> indicando la aparición de una estrella (4QEn 77,3; cp. 78,6) y con este verbo se señala también el brote de la planta de la verdad (4QEn 10,16).

El infinitivo ἐπιφάνειν puede indicar la finalidad de la “visita”

---

y es entonces cuando “el rey Mesías brotará” (צמח), pues está escrito: “con las nubes del cielo” y “a él le da el poder, la gloria” (Dn 7,13-14); cf. S. BUBER, *Midraschim* (heb.) III (Wilno 1925) 70.

<sup>(186)</sup> A. JACOBI, “ANATOAH ΕΞ ΥΨΟΥC”, *ZNTW* 20 (1921) 213.

<sup>(187)</sup> W. BAUER, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Berlin 1971) 602a.

<sup>(188)</sup> Una vez se aplica a la aparición de los astros (He 27,20), otra representa una cita del AT (He 2,10). Los otros casos son: 2Te 2,8 Tt 2,11; 3,4.

<sup>(189)</sup> J.C. GREENFIELD – M. SOKOLOF, “The Contributions of Qumran Aramaic to the Aramaic Vocabulary”, *Studies* (ed. T. MURAOKA) 87 cp. 96.

<sup>(190)</sup> STEVENSON, *Grammar*, 66.

(v. 78) o — de acuerdo con el ܠ arameo — una modalidad de la misma (“nos visitará ... mostrándose”). Una ulterior finalidad o consecuencia de la aparición será para el griego el enderezar el camino, aunque en arameo se pueden considerar las dos acciones expresadas en infinitivo como aposiciones, aunque la primera represente cierta anterioridad lógica con respecto a la segunda. La primera indicaría que incluso quienes están en la sombra podrán contemplar, mientras la segunda expresaría una conclusión final. Es así como lo entendió Ireneo: *apparuit his qui in tenebris et umbra sedebant, et direxit pedes nostros in viam pacis*<sup>(191)</sup>. Hay que notar sin embargo que ambas acciones, sobre todo la segunda<sup>(192)</sup>, aunque se realicen con la presencia del Germen son obra de Dios<sup>(193)</sup> y están dinamizadas por su amor fiel. Es sólo así como se pueden establecer unos paralelismos entre προπορεύσει > ἐτοιμάσαι + τοῦ δοῦναι y ἐπεσκέψατο > ἐπιφάνει + τοῦ κατευθῆναι. Y es así en línea con la última acción reservada sólo a Dios como S (ya lo ha hecho en el v. 77 con P) cambia (con P) el infinitivo κατευθῆναι (H) por el futuro de 3ª persona de ܠܕܝ (“para que él enderece”), siguiéndolo al Diatéssaron, aunque el infinitivo anterior (P y H) lo cambia S en un futuro de 2ª persona dirigido al niño (“tú iluminarás”) en claro contraste con LP que con la 3ª persona lo refiere al Germen; pero esta concretización realizada por S del ἐτοιμάσαι en el ἐπιφάνει<sup>(194)</sup>, más que una traducción, es una interpretación que adscribe una función iluminante al profeta, iluminado él mismo por la visita del Germen mesiánico (Jn 5,35; cp. 1,7-9).

A la figura mesiánica en Qumrán se le atribuye la función de כפר para remisión de los pecados, lo que tendrá lugar en su iluminante actuación como presencia de la benevolencia de Dios para con la humanidad (v. 77-78)<sup>(195)</sup>. En el himno se hace notar ahora que la epifanía del brote mesiánico beneficia τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις. Esto reproduce el TM del SI 107,10 (cp. 14), pero con variaciones, formuladas en un griego de elegante

<sup>(191)</sup> *Ad.Haer.* III, 10,2.

<sup>(192)</sup> SI 5,9; 25,12,11; 139,24; 143,8.

<sup>(193)</sup> ERNST, *Lukas*, 98.

<sup>(194)</sup> Es el iotacismo sin duda el responsable del cambio ἐπιφάνει - ἐπιφανῆ - ἐπιφανεῖ (Cron.Pasch. 378; cf. C. TISCHENDORF, *Novum Testamentum Graece* [Leipzig 1969] 425).

<sup>(195)</sup> J.M. BAUMGARTEN, “Messianic Forgiveness of Sin in CD 14:19”, *Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. D.W. PARRY - E. ULRICH) 544. Cf. et. 4QTestLev II,1,2s.

hipérbaton; así nace una dicción exclusiva de este autor. El giro “sentado en tinieblas” (Is 42,7 en singular colectivo) hace alusión a quien está prisionero (Is 49,9) y llega a experimentar la libertad de Dios (v. 74), mientras la expresión que califica a quien camina o habita en una “sombra de muerte” (Is 9,1 SI 23,4) puede apuntar a quien necesita una iluminación en su vida, un sentido, para poder avanzar con seguridad (cp. Is 60,1-3). Para “tiniebla” el término más normal en AQ es חשך (S, P, H cf. et. SI 107,2); el קבל (TIs 42,7; 49,9) es raro (11QtgJb 24,15), y חבל (LP) es interpretación: “desgracia, ruina”. La expresión “sombra de muerte” corresponde al hebreo צלמות que originalmente pudo significar simplemente oscuridad o una gran sombra (por el plural intensivo צלמות), pero la vocalización del TM con קָוָה (modo peculiar de construir el superlativo)<sup>(196)</sup> con su alusión a la “muerte” (LXX y T) le hace símbolo de toda la negatividad, cuya resolución definitiva se espera sólo de Dios. Por esto S y P universalizan el término con el plural “sombras”. Para este sustantivo el AQ – y también el siríaco – usan el término טלל (4QEn 4,1; 11QtgJb 36,29), que luego en T se convierte en טל (TIs 9,1 TJe 9,36).

Como tras la liberación de los enemigos viene el adorar (v. 74-74), tras la liberación de las sombras viene el caminar; y como a la adoración acompañaba la santidad y la justicia, al recto camino le acompaña la paz. Pero hay que notar a nivel lingüístico que κατεσθῆναι τοὺς πόδας no se conoce en LXX y que κατεσθῆναι en el NT aparece sólo 2x (1Te 3,11; 2Te 3,5), aunque el concepto corresponda a ideas presentes en el TM (SI 37,23; 40,3) y también en Qumrán (1QH 7,14). Al tratar de dar con la correspondencia semítica de κατεσθῆναι (LXX) – prescindiendo de las paráfrasis – se nota que el verbo que le corresponde en TM es ישר (Is 40,3), empleado aquí como hebraísmo por LP (cf. et. v. 75) y que indica la rectitud y la justicia, pero sobre todo lo es כּוּן y su paralelo תּוּן, que es el que prevalece en arameo como חקן con su sentido de “establecer” (Dn 4,33), “afianzar” (4QEn 89,8), “dirigir” (T1Cr 29,18) y “disponer” (T2Cr 19,3). Cuando el complemento directo son los “pasos” sea con el sentido de “enderezar” (SI 37,23) o con el de “fortificar” (SI 40,3; 119,133), el sujeto de la acción es fundamentalmente Dios (1QH 7,4), aunque se hace notar también la colaboración humana (SI 119,5); y lo mismo ocurre cuando se trata

(196) H. NIEHR, “צִלְמָוֶת; ṣalmāwæt”, *TWAT* VI, 1056-1057.

del “corazón” (Pr 21,1), apuntando así a una dimensión ética de este concepto (Pr 9,6 Sir 49,3 TestSim 5,2), como parte también de la misión docente de la figura mesiánica (CD 1,10s), de la que aquí se siente beneficiario el cantor como miembro de su comunidad religiosa.

Si un sentido ético de “enderezar el camino” (Pr 4,26 Jdt 12,8) podría corresponder a “preparar el camino” (v. 76), hay que notar que aquí no se trata de enderezar el camino, sino de “enderezar los pies por el camino”. Se trata de un causativo: de colocar los pies de modo recto. Y el causativo es lo que se expresa con el afel arameo, indicando que es Dios quien hace que la persona se enderece. No se trata tampoco de enderezar los pies en (עַל) el camino (Pr 9,15), sino de enderezar los pies hacia (עִלָּם) el camino. Esta distinción entre ambas preposiciones es la que media entre עַל y עִלָּם en un contexto de ruta (1 Sam 6,12). Y la preposición aramea עִלָּם con la que se construye חָקַן (Dn 4,33; 4QEn 89,8) es la que se encuentra en el AQ traducida luego con el עִלָּם de matiz direccional (4QEn 6,6). De este modo se quiere indicar en el himno no tanto por dónde se mueven los pasos (Sl 23,3), ni qué sendas van recorriendo (cf. Sl 85,3; 1QH 7,14), sino cuál es la dirección<sup>(197)</sup> a la que se ordena el camino en el que se afianzan los pasos<sup>(198)</sup>. Este camino es el de la paz. La paz, según el sentido semítico del genitivo (v. 76 Sl 23,3; 1QH 7,14), define la naturaleza del camino: es un camino pacífico, que conduce a la paz (cp. Sl 16,11 Jr 21,8 Ba 3,31) y en el que se vive la paz<sup>(199)</sup>.

La expresión “camino de paz” no se encuentra en Qumrán y es hapax tanto en el AT (Is 41,3) como en el NT, a pesar de que a “camino” se le califica con diversos epítetos<sup>(200)</sup> y que a la paz se alude con frecuencia como atmósfera que llena una situación o por la que una persona se mueve (cf. vgr. Is 41,3). Es un último rasgo de originalidad. Hay que notar que la paz, como final, es el deseo cumbre de la bendición sacerdotal (Nm, 6,26); ella es expresión de la epifanía de Dios, y en Qumrán (1QS 2,3-4) incluye también el “conocimiento de la vida” (v. 77). No es pues extraño que un himno,

(197) M.Ph. ZEHNDER, *Wegmetaphorik im Alten Testament* (Berlin 1999) 337.

(198) 1 Cr 29,18 Jdt 3,18 Sir 51,10 Pr 4,26 LXX Is 53,3.

(199) Sl 25,10; 119,30; 2 Sam 18,13; 1 Re 8,36 Jb 28,4.

(200) Cf. vgr. Gn 24,48 Jc 2,22; 1 Sam 22,23 Jb 24,4 Sl 102,23; 107,7; 119,14.32s; 139,24 Pr 2,8; 3,17; 4,10s; 5,6 Qo 11,5.9 Sb 10,17 Ba 3,27 etc.

en boca de un sacerdote como Zacarías, concluya con una mención de la paz, pues es al sacerdote a quien le toca pronunciar este tipo de bendición con la paz (1QS 2,1)<sup>(201)</sup>. La paz concluye así el Benedictus como concluye el SI 29 (v. 11): el Dios que ha sido ensalzado como “bendito” es quien “bendice” a su pueblo con la paz por medio de quien ha sido denominado “germen de paz” (Ez 34,29 LXX) y “príncipe de la paz” (Is 9,5), en cuyo reino se presagia una paz sin límites “hasta que falte la luna” (SI 72,7 Is 66,12), es decir, eterna. Esta paz no es simplemente 𐤊𐤋𐤁 (H), “tranquilidad”, equivalente al hebreo שָׁלוֹם, sino 𐤊𐤋𐤁𐤁 (S, P, LP)<sup>(202)</sup> con todo lo que la raíz שָׁלַם implica de perfección y felicidad, vinculada a la remisión de los pecados (MI 2,5-6 cp. SI 55,19) y a la justicia (Is 32,17 SI 85,11). Es la paz operada por el “Dios de la paz” (Jc 6,24), que instituye su “alianza de paz”<sup>(203)</sup>.

\* \* \*

Ahora, al final de este recorrido y antes de presentar la traducción del Benedictus al arameo se imponen algunas consideraciones de carácter general. En primer lugar, que esta versión se realizará en plena fidelidad al texto griego, sin violentarlo. Y se verá que de la traducción aramea emerge toda una gran carga poética. Ella muestra, como no lo hace el griego, el ritmo de un himno que además se ajusta a lo conocido por la métrica bíblica acerca del valor de la frase, el paralelismo y los acentos. Sobre todo la rima se hace especialmente sonora en arameo, quedando patente de modo particular en los sufijos y finales. El mismo ritmo de la frase parece que va acompañando el contenido temático con sus cadencias: sus movimientos largos y amplios, ensamblados y continuos, serenos y solemnes que se combinan con los cortos, ágiles y rápidos, para irse retardando en las conclusiones. Y es además el mismo paralelismo de los temas<sup>(204)</sup>, con su diverso énfasis, el que determina la variedad de la versificación<sup>(205)</sup>.

(201) Según las prescripciones qumránicas a los levitas corresponde pronunciar las maldiciones (1QS 2,3b cp. Dt 27,13-15).

(202) Para los distintos matices de estos vocablos cp. Lc 12,51 y 24,36 en S.

(203) Nm 25,12 Is 54,10 Ez 34,25; 38,26 Si 45,24.

(204) A. VANHOYE, “Structure du ‘Benedictus’”, NTS 12 (1965-66) 382-389.

(205) J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible* (Assan 1998) 1, 9, 23.

Por lo que respecta al arameo como lengua hay que notar que era la hablada en el s. I en Palestina, donde hay presencia también de hebreo, trazas de griego y ecos de latín. Pero el escribir en hebreo suponía el haber realizado una opción sociológica concreta<sup>(206)</sup>, que no consta en el autor de este himno. El arameo como lengua franca es el que se usa en las cartas y contratos; y se mantiene también en oraciones, cantos (sinagogales) e himnos<sup>(207)</sup>, como evidencia la presencia de este tipo de plegarias arameas en Qumrán (1QapGn 20,12-16; 22,16-17; 4QOrNab; 4QTestLev 5,10-6,10), donde se conserva de modo privilegiado el arameo palestino de la época neotestamentaria<sup>(208)</sup>. Por otra parte, la himnología aramea subsiste también en textos hoy conocidos en griego (TestLev 1,10-2,10), pero que son traducciones del arameo<sup>(209)</sup>. Y un testigo relevante de esta himnología aramea son las siríacas Odas de Salomón del s. I d.C.<sup>(210)</sup>. De hecho no hay evidencia en la época neotestamentaria de un eucologio de tipo judío que se hubiera compuesto originalmente sólo en griego (cf. vgr. Dn 3,26-45.52-90 LXX Tb 3,11-15; 8,15-17; 1 Mac 4,30-35 SIsal 5,1 etc.).

La himnología palestina precristiana ha dejado trazas de sí en el arameo del Qaddish, que refleja una popular oración presinagogal<sup>(211)</sup>, posteriormente reglamentada en el rabinismo, pero que

<sup>(206)</sup> M.O. WISE, "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran", *Studies* (ed. T. MURAOKA) 136-137. El mismo Fl. Josefo escribió la 1a ed. del *BJ* (I, 3.6) en arameo, su lengua materna, y luego fue ayudado para su traducción al griego; cf. L.H. FELDMAN, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley 1998) 25-28. Además, como se sabe, quienes escriben en hebreo en esa época se resienten fuertemente de aramaísmos.

<sup>(207)</sup> J.C. GREENFIELD, "Aramaic and the Jews", *JSS* 4 (1995) 1-18 esp.15.

<sup>(208)</sup> J.A. FITZMYER, "The Aramaic Levi Document", *Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. D.W. PARRY – E. ULRICH) 460.

<sup>(209)</sup> M.A. KNIBB, "Perspectives on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: The Levi Tradition", *Perspectives* (eds. F. GARCÍA – Ed. NOORT) 212.

<sup>(210)</sup> J.H. CHARLESWORTH, *Critical Reflexions on the Odes of Solomon* (Sheffield 1998) 14-15, 22, 113.

<sup>(211)</sup> I. ELBOGEN, *Jewish Liturgy. A Comprehensive Study* (New York 1993) 80-84. Lo mismo se diga en la Amidá, cuyas expresiones fijadas en Palestina en tiempo de Gamaliel II (90-110 d.C.), se supone, en sus rasgos fundamentales preceden a la destrucción del templo. Su uso reconocido en la Sinagoga es posterior, como posterior a la Palestina es la recensión de Babilonia, donde se menciona al "brote mesiánico y a su fuerza (cuerno)"; cf. id. 34-36.

siguió manteniendo su formulación aramea<sup>(212)</sup>. Con este tipo de oraciones en arameo, compuestas por sacerdotes, acompañaba el pueblo las ofrendas en el templo<sup>(213)</sup>, como con las oraciones arameas escritas por letrados se iniciaba la instrucción en el Bet-haMidrash<sup>(214)</sup>. Todas estas oraciones en arameo se construían en un estilo simple pero artístico, mezcla de lo fijo y lo libre – como se nota también en los himnos qumránicos – que luego desembocarán en el género de los *piyyutim*, donde presiona también el arameo<sup>(215)</sup>.

Esas oraciones, originalmente espontáneas y luego amañadas en el escrito, reflejan en los rasgos escritos la esencia de la Berakah típica y conservan ribetes del lenguaje bíblico aunque usado con libertad, pues además responden a situaciones concretas que se insertan en el conjunto de la alabanza. Las características de esta himnología, que permanece en la época rabínica, son: el construir una frase por línea poética y el paralelismo, junto con la rima sobre todo en el uso de los pronombres personales. Esto en el estilo, y por lo que respecta a los conceptos: la fórmula inicial de alabanza a Dios, la mención del Nombre y del reino, el agradecimiento por las gestas del Señor con frecuencia introducidas por el relativo y expresadas con el verbo en pasado como acciones programáticas suyas, la referencia a la relación de Dios con los patriarcas y la compasión para con su pueblo, rasgo éste frecuente en las oraciones arameas; y además, el don de la redención, la liberación y el mesianismo. Todo esto cantado por quien habla en plural, inserto en una comunidad, aunque no oficial, y que incluso le puede responder (cf. 1 Cr 16,36)<sup>(216)</sup>. No hay duda que rasgos como éstos coinciden en gran parte con el Benedictus, al que no raramente se le reconoce

<sup>(212)</sup> W. STAERK, *Altjüdische liturgische Gebete* (Berlin 1930) 30-32.

<sup>(213)</sup> D. SOLA POOL, *The Kaddish* (Leipzig 1909) 13.

<sup>(214)</sup> HEINEMANN, *Prayer in the Talmud*, 265-266.

<sup>(215)</sup> El arameo se mantenía en las oraciones populares, no estatutarias, en las de carácter privado que se componían también para ocasiones particulares y las recitaba un individuo. A pesar de la hebraización rabínica, el arameo del pueblo se hacía presente en la poesía religiosa; cf. vgr. L.J. WEINBERGER, *Jewish Hymnography* (London 1998) 14, 19, 163, 179, 189, 306.

<sup>(216)</sup> P. WINTER, "Magnificat and Benedictus – Maccabean Psalms?", *BJRyL* 37 (1954) 331. Para las características formales de la poética aramea, cf. A.S. RODRIGUES PEREIRA, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E. – 600 C.E.)* (Assen 1997) 272-290. Pero una clasificación técnica poética de estas composiciones se hace prácticamente imposible; cf. MITTMANN, *Magnifikat*, 66-67.



un tinte semítico superior incluso al del contexto y también el haber sido traducido de un original semita<sup>(217)</sup>.

Como conclusión global se puede formular ya una impresión que de todo este estudio emerge sobre la naturaleza del *Benedictus*. Se trata de una impresión, pues en estos temas es casi imposible llegar más allá con absoluta certeza; pero parece una impresión justificada, aunque la validez de cada una de las proposiciones sea diversa, pues depende de la fuerza de las razones que la acompañan. Según esto, el *Benedictus* sería un canto que rezuma espiritualidad bíblica, pero su autor es original y en sus giros no se atiene a las formulaciones ni del TM ni de LXX. Quien ofrece este himno en griego lo hace como buen grecista, pero no presenta una composición en griego elegante sino con frecuencia anómalo, pues parece condicionado por una base a la que trata de ser fiel, sin que su trabajo se pueda vincular con certeza a ninguna corriente literaria determinada<sup>(218)</sup>. El texto base, mejor que al hebreo, responde al arameo; y sus conceptos corresponden a la cultura palestina del s. I. No se trata de una composición litúrgica, sino poético-personal, pero abierta a un grupo que participa de su espiritualidad, llena de esperanza mesiánica y como tal apta para señalar sus actualizaciones, aunque no las incluya necesariamente de modo explícito como realizadas ya. Es un canto unitario de alabanza a Dios, en cuyas notas entra la mención de un niño a quien se le desea vinculado a la obra salvífica del Señor.

Todo esto naturalmente no desdice, sino que encaja razonablemente con los rasgos ofrecidos por Lc al presentar el *Benedictus*, que aquí se incluye ahora traducido al arameo en línea con las observaciones de este artículo y con la vocalización tradicional que ayuda a captar la sonoridad del himno<sup>(219)</sup>. Como es

<sup>(217)</sup> P. BENOIT – M.E. BOISMARD – J.L. MALILLOS, *Sinopsis de los Cuatro Evangelios* (Bilbao 1977) 55. Para los criterios que señalan este texto griego como traducción del semítico cf. R.A. MARTIN, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (Missoula, MN 1974) 5-43; id., *Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels* (New York 1987) 106-128.

<sup>(218)</sup> Cf. J. GRASHAM MACHEN, "The Hymns of the First Chapter of Luke", *PrincThR* 10 (1912) 1-38

<sup>(219)</sup> Cf. vgr. el sonido ç en los finales de los pares (2+2+2+2) del v. 76 y el sonido â en los (2+2+2) del v. 78. Es la retraducción al arameo la que pone de relieve sobre todo esta sonoridad; cf. J.H. CHARLESWORTH, "Semitisms in the New Testament and the Need to Clarify the Importance of the Syriac New Testament"; *Salvación en la Palabra*, Hom. A. Díez Macho (ed. D. MUÑOZ LEÓN) (Madrid 1986) 637.

sabido, en la métrica bíblica algunas palabras pueden presentarse unidas a otras o separadas según el ritmo que se desee en la frase; en este himno las diversas aliteraciones de tales términos<sup>(220)</sup> seguirían confirmando con sus acentos el carácter poético del *Benedictus*.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

Jesús LUZARRAGA

#### SUMMARY

This is the first translation of the *Benedictus* into the Palestinian Aramaic of the time and it casts some light on certain features of the hymn which seems steeped in the biblical culture that surrounds it, not surpassing it but differing from the MT and the LXX in the details of its modes of expression, nor showing signs of dependence on any particular Greek literary trend. There may be an Aramaic background to this hymn for it is capable of faithfully rendering the sometimes irregular Greek and fits in well with the contents and forms of the prayers of its time and with the requirements of poetry. All its lines together make up one ode to God into which good wishes called down upon a child are inserted.

<sup>(220)</sup> Cf. vgr. רחמי חסד, בקר לנא, קרן פרקן, בבית דוד, ומיד-כל, קים-קדושה, למפלח לה, קדם מרה, נביא עליון, כל-יומנא.

[illegible]

## **Two Assyrian Campaigns against Hezekiah and Later Eighth Century Biblical Chronology**

### **1. Two Assyrian Campaigns against Hezekiah**

The most controversial period for the royal chronology of Israel and Judah is the later 8<sup>th</sup> century BC. Much of the problem appears to center on 2 Kgs 18,13's dating of a massive invasion of Judah by Sennacherib to Hezekiah's 14<sup>th</sup> year. As extremely widely accepted, this massive invasion is clearly identifiable with Sennacherib's known such invasion in 701. But dating Hezekiah's 14<sup>th</sup> year to 701 conflicts with other biblical data and has been very widely rejected in recent studies. With the help of recent shifts in viewpoint concerning 2 Kgs 18,14-16, the Azekah text, and the fall of Samaria, it appears possible to reconstruct the historical situation hidden behind this apparent biblical error as follows.

2 Kgs 18,13–19,37, together with the parallel account in Isa 36–37, and Assyrian sources for the 701 campaign both tell of a massive invasion of Judah by Sennacherib which included an Assyrian approach to, but not assault on, Jerusalem<sup>(1)</sup>. Any possibility of distinguishing between these invasions appears eliminated, for the bulk of the biblical material, by the good agreement of Assyrian and biblical sources — when read between the lines of competing claims of victory — is on a *limited* Assyrian setback. Thus, as emphasized by e.g. Millard, Assyrian records indicate that Sennacherib let Hezekiah off very easily, especially in view of his marked hostility towards “the Judaeans”, and leave the end of the 701 campaign strangely obscure — *except* for tribute eventually sent by Hezekiah to Nineveh. In spite of 2 Kgs 19,35's historically impossible 185,000 Assyrian dead, prophecies in this chapter likewise point to only a limited Assyrian setback (a

Note: the translation of biblical texts in this article follows the *NEB* unless specified otherwise.

(<sup>1</sup>) For references on 2 Kgs 18,13–19,37 and Isa 36–37, see recently M.A. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1–39: with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL 16; Grand Rapids 1995) 459-460, 487-488. For Assyrian records of the 701 campaign, see conveniently *ANET* 287-288; *ARAB* II, §§283-284a.

difference in viewpoint that strongly supports the authenticity of these prophecies): vv. 28 and 32-34 promise concerning this campaign only that Sennacherib will fail to complete his conquest of Judah, while vv. 29-31 depict an impoverished Judaeans remnant, confirmed by archaeology<sup>(2)</sup>.

The clearly indicated and extremely widely accepted setting of at least the bulk of 2 Kgs 18,13-19,37 in 701 does raise a number of well-known issues. One problem arises from 2 Kgs 19,9's reference to a military force led by "Tirhakah, king of Cush", i.e. Taharqa, who did not become king until 690. However, the absence of any additional good argument for a post-701 Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah<sup>(3)</sup> strongly suggests explaining Taharqa's title in 2 Kgs 19,9 by prolepsis. This explanation — i.e. Taharqa's command in Palestine in 701 as a *prince* — is strongly supported by a combination of 2 Kgs 19,9 with Kawa stelae IV,7-10; V,13-17 and other evidence: taken together, these stelae indicate that Taharqa led a military force north to Thebes under his predecessor Shebitku and then proceeded to the Delta with that king. This can very plausibly be connected with a Nubian intervention in 2 Kgs 19,9 / 701 — especially since Shebitku is given 12 years by Eusebius and chose an unusually martial titulary, whereas his predecessor Shabako is attested in friendly relations with Sargon II and probably with Sennacherib<sup>(4)</sup>.

(2) See for the pertinent archaeological evidence e.g. N. NA'AMAN, "Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah and the Date of the *lmlk* Stamps", *VT* 29 (1979) 70-74, especially 73-74; id., "Hezekiah and the Kings of Assyria", *Tel Aviv* 21 (1994) 113-115.

(3) Compare and contrast periodical article indices under the following title keywords: Second Palestinian Campaign.

(4) See K.A. KITCHEN, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100 – 650 B.C.)* (Warminster 1972) 155-161. A widely accepted upper limit of 713/712 for the start of Shabako's reign over all Egypt for c.14 years or a bit longer (with no evidence for a coregency) hardly seems consistent with Shebitku's accession by 702/701. However, the possibility of taking a clearly Egyptian "*pir'u* king of Egypt" appealed for help against Assyria in 713/712 to be an east Delta *surrogate* for Shabako (temporarily back in Nubia) vitiates any use of this appeal to set an upper limit for Shabako's conquest of the Delta. Further applying such surrogacy to 2 Kgs 17,4's So (as vassal of Piye) vitiates the process of elimination widely used to identify So with Sais — thereby avoiding the need to emend away a common biblical formula ("to PN king of GN") and hypothesize otherwise unknown Saite resistance to Assyrian rule in Asia.

Other difficulties, arising from the beginning of 2 Kgs 18,13–19,37, appear to be more pregnant for biblical history.

As currently very widely accepted, 2 Kgs 18,13's dating of Sennacherib's massive invasion (v. 13b) to year 14 of Hezekiah (v. 13a) appears untenable because other biblical evidence bearing on the dating of this regnal year clearly places it prior to 701 (so e.g. 2 Kgs 16,2.5-9; 18,10; Isa 14,28-32)<sup>(6)</sup>.

2 Kgs 18,14-16 is widely thought to tally with events in 701, but actually fits very poorly with these events, as recently emphasized by Seitz<sup>(6)</sup>, since it reports a *smaller* amount of Judean tribute sent to Lachish *during* the Assyrian campaign. This surrender on terms also appears to contradict 2 Kgs 18,17–19,37, which relates a continuing conflict ending with an Assyrian setback.

These discrepancies can both be resolved by setting 2 Kgs 18,14-16 during an Assyrian campaign in year 14 of Hezekiah that actually *preceded* the massive invasion in 2 Kgs 18,13b; 18,17–19,37 / 701 (but had already been confused with it by the time 2 Kgs 18,13 was written)<sup>(7)</sup>. Such a sequence fits very well with the lesser tribute and (to all appearances) less extensive invasion in 2 Kgs 18,14-16. An obvious objection is that a pre-701 Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah would clearly have been the work of Sargon II rather than Sennacherib, who did not campaign in the west before 701. However confusion on this point is hardly unthinkable for a *limited* invasion.

Strong support for such confusion arises from recent recognition that the definitive conquest of Samaria in 2 Kgs 17,6 — implicitly assigned to Shalmaneser V by vv. 3-6 (cf. also v. 5 with 2 Kgs 18,9)

<sup>(6)</sup> See recently e.g. H. TADMOR, "The Chronology of the First Temple Period: A Presentation and Evaluation of the Sources", *History of Ancient Israel* (J.A. SOGGIN) (Philadelphia 1984) 381; J.H. HAYES – S.A. IRVINE, *Isaiah, The Eighth Century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching* (Nashville 1987) 375-376; B. BECKING, *The Fall of Samaria: An Historical and Archaeological Study* (Leiden – New York 1992) 52-54; G. GALIL, *The Chronology of the Kings of Israel and Judah* (SHCANE 9; Leiden – New York 1996) 98-104. Contrast recently N. NA'AMAN, "Historical and Chronological Notes on the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the Eighth Century B.C.", *VT* 36 (1986) 84-85; id., "Kings of Assyria", 236-239. See further below with nn. 34-35.

<sup>(6)</sup> C.R. SEITZ, "Account A and the Annals of Sennacherib: A Reassessment", *JSOT* 58 (1993) 50-52.

<sup>(7)</sup> See further on this apparent confusion the end of §1. See e.g. C.R. SEITZ, *Zion's Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36-39* (Minneapolis 1991) 51-56 for the strong case in favor of separating the introductory 2 Kgs 18,13 from vv. 14-16.

— was really the work of Sargon II<sup>(8)</sup>. On this basis, reference by 2 Kgs 17,3; 18,9 to Shalmaneser instead of Sargon in connection with the fall of Samaria provides a remarkable parallel for the proposed reference by 2 Kgs 18,13 to Sennacherib in error for Sargon in connection with 2 Kgs 18,14-16's campaign. This evident aversion to mentioning Sargon II would seem to be related to Isa 14,20's hoped-for *proscription* of a tyrant who is generally identified as Sargon II<sup>(9)</sup>.

Strong corroboration of this approach is provided by the Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah described in the fragmentary Azekah text, which is now widely and very plausibly assigned to Sargon II<sup>(10)</sup>. Before attempting to correlate biblical and Assyrian sources on a Judaeen campaign by Sargon II, consider several additional biblical texts which appear connected to a limited Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah preceding the massive invasion in 2 Kgs 18,13b; 18,17-19,37 / 701.

2 Kgs 20,1-11 (and Isa 38) date a near-fatal illness suffered by Hezekiah to his 14<sup>th</sup> year (cf. v. 6 with 2 Kgs 18,2) and around the time of an Assyrian invasion (v. 1, cf. v. 6). This illness was followed in 2 Kgs 20,12-19 (and Isa 39) by Hezekiah's reception of gift-bearing messengers from a "king of Babylon" clearly identifiable as

(<sup>8</sup>) So Laato, Na'aman, Galil. For the Assyrian sources on Sargon II's capture of Samaria in 720, followed by large-scale deportations and the reorganization of Samaria as a province, see H. TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study", *JCS* 12 (1958) 33-39; conveniently *ANET* 284-285. For 2 Kgs 17-18's false attribution of this definitive conquest/deportation to Shalmaneser V, see N. NA'AMAN "The Historical Background to the Conquest of Samaria", *Bib* 71 (1990) 219; G. GALIL, "The Last Years of the Kingdom of Israel and the Fall of Samaria", *CBQ* 57 (1995) 61-62; similarly A. LAATO, "New Viewpoints on the Chronology of the Kings of Israel and Judah", *ZAW* 98 (1986) 217. See further §3 below.

(<sup>9</sup>) See e.g. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1-39*, 232-233 with references for Isa 14,4b-21 celebrating the death of Sargon II in 705.

(<sup>10</sup>) G. GALIL, e.g. in "A New Look at the 'Azekah Inscription'", *RB* 102 (1995) 327-328 very plausibly sets the Azekah text in 712 (see further below following n. 26), as also found attractive by e.g. M. COGAN – H. TADMOR, *II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 11; New York 1988) 262, n. 6. BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 54 with n. 30 sets this text in 715. While Na'aman has set this text in 701 since 1974, the arguments given then for this setting have mostly been withdrawn. In 1994, Na'aman relied *solely* on the argument that "such a major campaign" against Judah is not substantiated except in 701 (NA'AMAN, "Kings of Assyria", 245). However, "such a major campaign" is not substantiated by the Azekah text, either!

Marduk-apla-iddina II (vv. 12-13). As widely accepted, the latter episode can hardly be set in (or after) 701, since this king fled from Babylon for the last time in 703<sup>(11)</sup>.

Since v. 13's leisurely display of wealth to these messengers and vv. 17-18's strictly long-term prophecy in response to this display<sup>(12)</sup> hardly fit with an impending invasion, it appears that 2 Kgs 20's gift-bearing embassy occurred in the wake of its invasion — especially since this sequence is presumably implied by 2 Chr 32,22-23's many explicitly post-invasion diplomatic gifts to Hezekiah. But setting 2 Kgs 20,12-19 in the wake of the invasion in 2 Kgs 18,13b; 18,17-19,37 / 701 (or later) appears contradicted by Hezekiah's extensive display of wealth to this embassy in v. 13 (contrast 2 Kgs 18,13b; 19,29-31 and Sennacherib's own claims of destruction, as well as archaeological confirmation [n.2 above] of a Judaeian disaster in 701). This dating also appears very unlikely due to: (1) the continued plotting which the Babylonian embassy presumably implies (contrast Hezekiah's shipment of tribute to Nineveh shortly *after* the 701 campaign), and (2) Hezekiah's to all appearances extremely complacent response in v. 19 to Isaiah's clear condemnation of this display in vv. 17-18<sup>(13)</sup>. On the other hand,

<sup>(11)</sup> Contrast e.g. NA'AMAN, "Kings of Assyria", 244, which fudges this difficulty by dating these messengers to "about 704/703", described as the "eve" of Sennacherib's invasion.

<sup>(12)</sup> 2 Kgs 20,17-18 is couched in terms of sons "who *will* be born to" Hezekiah (cf. also v. 19). This passage is generally taken to be an obviously inauthentic echo of an early 6<sup>th</sup> century Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem (so e.g. COGAN – TADMOR, *II Kings*, 262-263; P.R. ACKROYD, "An Interpretation of the Babylonian Exile: A Study of 2 Kings 20, Isaiah 38-39", *SJT* 27 [1974] 341-342). However this understanding is not supported by a textual comparison with 2 Kgs 24-25, suggesting a basis for 2 Kgs 20,17-18 in earlier material that was *not* reworked for the sake of better accord with early 6<sup>th</sup> century events. In view of 2 Kgs 20,14-19's surprisingly negative portrayal of Hezekiah, this earlier material seems best understood as essentially historical in origin (see further n. 23 below). On this basis, 2 Kgs 20,17's emphasis on Hezekiah's extensive display corroborates v. 13's like emphasis.

<sup>(13)</sup> Contrast 2 Kgs 19,1's royal repentance. Hezekiah's repentance in 2 Kgs 19,1 could theoretically be edifying legend, but fits extremely well with his otherwise seemingly hopeless position in 701. In recent years, Hezekiah's response to Isaiah in 2 Kgs 20,19 has widely been thought appropriate. However this view fails to reckon with Hezekiah's *ongoing* culpability in 2 Kgs 20,17-18's extremely negative prophecy against his house — as clearly indicated by the correspondence between vv. 13,15,17 and clarified by Isaiah's well-known strong hostility to 2 Kgs 20,12-13's policy of reliance on foreign



the aftermath of a limited pre-2 Kgs 18,17–19,37 / before 701 campaign is very consistent with Hezekiah's prosperity, lack of repentance and ongoing plotting in 2 Kgs 20.

In a similar vein, 2 Chr 32,2-5 indicates that Hezekiah began a much-needed strengthening of Jerusalem's defenses *during* an Assyrian invasion. This appears incredible during the invasion in 2 Kgs 18,17–19,37 / 701 (or any post-701 invasion), since: 1) Jerusalem appears to have been well fortified at this time (cf. Sennacherib's blockade in 701; 2 Kgs 18,27's readiness for a long siege)<sup>(14)</sup>. 2) In view of the great extent of this building activity, as revealed by archaeology<sup>(15)</sup>, it must have been completed *after* the invasion during which it was started; but Judah was ruined and apparently submissive after the campaign in 2 Kgs 18,17–19,37 / 701 (above with nn. 2-3). On the other hand, the limited preparation possible with such a late start provides a good background for the surrender on terms in 2 Kgs 18,14-16. This contrast is particularly important because 2 Chr 32,2-3's strangely late start appears to be confirmed by a striking parallel with Isa 22,8<sup>(16)</sup>.

As fairly often noted, Isa 22,1-14's invasion of Judah also conflicts with 2 Kgs 18,13b; 18,17–19,37 regarding e.g. vv. 12-14's utter lack of repentance (contrast 2 Kgs 19,1-2), v. 13's fatalistic revelry and feasting (contrast 2 Kgs 18,27), and the seeming focus of its invasion (cf. v. 7: "fairest valleys", v. 8: "covering of Judah" [literal translation]) on the lowlands (Shephelah) of western Judaea (contrast 2 Kgs 18,13b.17)<sup>(17)</sup>. On the other hand, this seeming focus

---

alliances (contrast untenably ACKROYD, "Babylonian Exile", 341; SERTZ, *Zion's Final Destiny*, 158). Under such circumstances, Hezekiah should have expressed repentance and changed his policy — which does *not* occur in 2 Kgs 20,19. See further n. 23 below.

<sup>(14)</sup> A historical basis for 2 Kgs 18,27 is strongly supported (with e.g. B.S. CHILDS, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* [SBT 2.ser.3; London 1967] 86, cf. 80-82) by a parallel with similarly improvisational Assyrian efforts to induce the surrender of Babylon c.730.

<sup>(15)</sup> See e.g. N. AVIGAD, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Nashville 1980) 55-57.

<sup>(16)</sup> See e.g. CHILDS, *Assyrian Crisis*, 106, 110 for this late start (and other connections between 2 Chr 32,2-5 and Isa 22,8-11) confirming a historical basis for 2 Chr 32,2-5 (as well as the pertinence of Isa 22,1-14 to an Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah). See also below following n. 36.

<sup>(17)</sup> See likewise on this conflict e.g. H.L. GINSBERG, "Reflexes of Sargon in Isaiah after 715 B.C.E.", *JAOS* 88 (1968) 48-49; J.N. OSWALT, *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1-39* (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1986) 407-408.

on the Shephelah is very consistent geographically with 2 Kgs 18,14-16 and politically with Hezekiah's prosperity, lack of repentance and ongoing plotting, apparently following 2 Kgs 20's campaign (above with nn.12-13). Likewise, the exceptionally harsh prophecy against stubbornly unrepentant high officials in Isa 22,14 is very plausibly connected politically to Hezekiah's extremely complacent reaction in 2 Kgs 20,19 (n. 13 above) to an equally harsh prophecy against the royal family.

Moreover, Isa 22,1-14 is widely and very plausibly dated to around the time of (presumably: slightly before) Isa 22,15-23(24), based on the extremely harsh and personal denunciations of unrepentant Judaeans officials in both sections, the threat of exile to Mesopotamia (very widely accepted referent of "great wide land") in v. 18, and the repetition in vv. 15-16 of expressions used in vv. 1.14<sup>(18)</sup>.

As often accepted, dating Isa 22,15-23(24) to the time of the events reflected in 2 Kgs 18,17-19,37 (or later) appears impossible because Eliakim is named in 2 Kgs 18,18,37 as the one who is "over the house" (cf. e.g. 2 Kgs 15,5: i.e. chief minister), but is only promised this post in Isa 22,20-21, when Shebna was "over the house" (v. 15)<sup>(19)</sup>. This dating also appears highly unlikely because Shebna repents in 2 Kgs 18,37-19,2 but decidedly not in Isa 22,15-19. On the other hand, dating Isa 22,15-24 significantly earlier than the Judaeans military disaster in 2 Kgs 18,17-19,37 / 701 would allow dating the seeming addition in v. 25 early enough to accommodate its extremely natural explanation as criticism of Eliakim's leading role in the 701 rebellion, couched in terms of the disaster that Isaiah expected as a result of this policy<sup>(20)</sup>.

<sup>(18)</sup> Cf. also vv. 8-11 with 2 Chr 32,2-5 and vv. 15.20 with 2 Kgs 19,2 for Isa 22 as a whole apparently clearly dating from the time of Isaiah. See likewise e.g. GINSBERG, "Reflexes", 49, n. 16; OSWALT, *Book of Isaiah*, 417.

<sup>(19)</sup> See e.g. J.T. WILLIS, "Historical Issues in Isaiah 22,15-25", *Bib* 74 (1993) 68-69 with n. 29 for this often-expressed view. See further e.g. OSWALT, *Book of Isaiah*, 418 on Shebna's titles.

<sup>(20)</sup> "On that day" everything "hanging" on Eliakim will be "destroyed", highly likely means at the time of a Judaeans military disaster. Isa 22,24's statement that "they shall hang upon him all the glory of his father's house" is usually combined with v. 25 and used to explain Eliakim's prophesied downfall by nepotism. However v. 25 very plausibly stands alone (with e.g. OSWALT, *Book of Isaiah*, 417) and there is no intrinsic reason to read nepotism into v. 24 — which can readily be taken as a positive reference to the extensive responsibilities prophesied for Eliakim (cf. SEITZ, *Zion's Final Destiny*, 112-

Further support for linking Isa 22,15-24 to the pre-2 Kgs 18,17-19,37 / pre-701 campaign worked out thus far is provided by several points of contact between these verses and 2 Kgs 20<sup>(21)</sup>. Cf.: (1) the exceptionally harsh, personal prophecy against the chief minister in Isa 22,15-19 with the equally harsh prophecy against the royal family in 2 Kgs 20,17-18; (2) the surprising prominence of the chief minister rather than the king in Isa 22,15-19 (dated c. vv. 1-14's invasion) with the invasion / near-fatal royal illness in 2 Kgs 20,1-11; (3) the remarkably exalted position promised to Eliakim, including power over "the key of the house of David" (Isa 22,22), with the compounding of Hezekiah's illness by his lack of sons (2 Kgs 20,18)<sup>(22)</sup>.

Additional material in 2 Chr 32 likewise supports confusion of the campaign reflected in 2 Kgs 18,13b; 18,17-19,37 with an earlier (i.e. pre-701) and much less destructive Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah: vv. 22-23 state that Hezekiah was "held in high honour by all the nations" and received many (diplomatic) gifts in the wake of vv. 9-21's invasion (which transparently reprises that of 2 Kgs 18,17-19,37), and vv. 24-25 state that Hezekiah's heart was "proud" following a serious illness<sup>(23)</sup>.

---

113). The seeming intrusion of Eliakim's family into matters of state in v. 24 can be very satisfactorily explained (with H.L. GINSBERG, "Gleanings in First Isaiah", *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* [New York 1953] 254) by his membership in the Judean royal family — as supported by the royal imagery in vv. 22-23, the extremely powerful position promised him in vv. 21-24, and membership in this family of two out of three other Eliakims attested in the bible (see e.g. 2 Kgs 23,34; Matt 1,13).

<sup>(21)</sup> Cf. HAYES – IRVINE, *Eighth Century Prophet*, 383-386.

<sup>(22)</sup> 2 Kgs 20,18 warns of punishment for the sons "who will be born to" Hezekiah, hardly meaning that older sons would be spared.

<sup>(23)</sup> Note in connection with n. 13 above: 2 Chr 32,31's evident approval of Hezekiah's behavior in the 2 Kgs 20,12-19 affair is widely thought (following ACKROYD, "Babylonian Exile", 337-338) to justify his behavior in 2 Kgs 20,19. But since 2 Kgs 20,13's extensive post-illness display is presumably connected with 2 Chr 32,25's post-illness pride, which is clearly criticized by the Chronicler, his approval in v. 31 must refer to post-pride repentance (i.e. to v. 26). Since 2 Kgs 20,19's response is unrepentant (pace ACKROYD, "Chronicler", 10-11), this repentance appears to follow the events reflected in 2 Kgs 20,12-19. This sequence would also allow the otherwise surprising inclusion of v. 31 in the close of 2 Chr 32 to be well explained as a *spin* on some event that could seem (i.e. in 2 Kgs 20,12-19) to contradict the Chronicler's highly positive summation of Hezekiah's reign.

While the Chronicler appears to have confused this eventual repentance

This juxtaposition is obviously related to the juxtaposition in 2 Kgs 18–19 / 2 Kgs 20 of Sennacherib's very destructive invasion of Judah / Hezekiah's reception of diplomatic gifts and display of extensive wealth following a serious illness in the same year as this invasion. One difference is that the gifts to Hezekiah in 2 Chr 32 are explicitly dated to after the Assyrian invasion. As already noted, this provides further support for the post-invasion dating of Marduk-apla-iddina II's gift-bearing messengers that appears to be indicated by 2 Kgs 20,13.19 and contradicts associating 2 Kgs 20 with the campaign in 2 Kgs 18,17–19,37 / 701 (see above with n. 12).

Another difference from 2 Kgs 18–20 is that the destructiveness of the Assyrian invasion and Hezekiah's repentance, which conflict with 2 Chr 32,23.25's strong diplomatic position and pride, seem to be missing: 2 Chr 32,1 states only that Sennacherib thought "he could" conquer the cities of Judah and vv. 9–21 omit any reference to a remnant or sackcloth. Actually, these elements have been separated out in what appears to be a clear doublet of vv. 9–21: the *sequel* to Hezekiah's to all appearances *already post-invasion* pride in v. 25<sup>(24)</sup> is a strikingly 2 Kgs 18,17–19,37-like episode involving "wrath ... upon Judah and Jerusalem" averted by repentance for Hezekiah and "the people of Jerusalem" *only* (2 Chr 32,25–26).

In spite of its confusion, this sequence supports the preceding analysis of 2 Kgs 18–20 by again placing a lesser Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah, reflected in 2 Kgs 20, before (a doublet of) the very destructive invasion reflected in 2 Kgs 18,17–19,37. Since the latter is clearly datable to 701, this understanding places v. 23's strong diplomatic position of Hezekiah in the period preceding the Judaeian disaster of 701, when a strong position for Hezekiah is substantiated

---

with Hezekiah's repentance in 2 Kgs 19,1 (see below at n. 24), an underlying reference in 2 Chr 32,26.31 to an earlier episode of royal repentance, dated not long after 2 Kgs 20,17–18's extremely strong prophecy against (in effect) Jerusalem, is strongly supported by clear evidence (Jer 26,18–19 citing Mic 3,12) for just such a sequence (which can plausibly be related to a campaign reflected in 2 Kgs 20; Isa 22, etc. via the parallel between Mic 3,9 and Isa 22,8–11). Dating the political repentance indicated by 2 Chr 32,26 prior to 701 would provide an excellent setting for the evident sacking (or demotion) of Shebna sometime between Isa 22,15–24 and the campaign in 2 Kgs 18,17 – 19,37 / 701 (cf. above including n. 19).

<sup>(24)</sup> Cf. his explicitly post-invasion high honour in v. 23 and apparently post-invasion great display / extreme complacency in 2 Kgs 20,13.19 (on which, see above with nn. 12–13).

for the period immediately preceding the 701 invasion by Sennacherib, and after which such strength appears impossible<sup>(25)</sup>.

A strong diplomatic position of Hezekiah following the campaign reflected in 2 Kgs 20 also helps considerably in explaining confusion between distinct campaigns reflected in 2 Kgs 18,14-16 / 2 Kgs 20 etc. and 2 Kgs 18,17-19,37 etc., as such strength would naturally have been connected to 2 Kgs 19,35's exaggerated Assyrian setback rather than 2 Kgs 18,14-16's Judaeans' surrender (taken in isolation).

## 2. Dating the Assyrian Campaign in Year 14 of Hezekiah to 712

Assyrian evidence provides only one clearly datable episode that can plausibly be connected with an Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah prior to 701. This episode involves Assyrian suppression in 712 of a plot organized by Ashdod, in which Judah was implicated<sup>(26)</sup>. While the limited records clearly pertaining to the 712 campaign mention only Ashdod as a target, the Assyrian conflict with Hezekiah reported by the extremely fragmentary Azekah text is increasingly widely (n. 10 above) and very plausibly thought to be part of the same campaign. This setting is partly based on difficulties for the only known alternative, a setting in 701: (1) The spelling used for Hezekiah in the Azekah text never occurs in known records of Sennacherib and that used for Assur never occurs in his known historical records<sup>(27)</sup>. (2) This text's implicit reference to Ashdod as a province<sup>(28)</sup> disagrees with known accounts of the 701

(25) A very strong diplomatic position of Hezekiah at *some* point appears highly likely due to his generally accepted defeat of Philistines (so e.g. J. GRAY, *I and II Kings: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia 1970] 671; COGAN – TADMOR, *II Kings*, 217, 221; NA'AMAN, "Kings of Assyria", 237) "as far as Gaza and its boundaries" (2 Kgs 18,8). Since this appears to go far beyond the situation in 701 (when Ashkelon was an independent kingdom occupying territory as far north as Joppa), it should probably be set under Sargon II (cf. below including n. 39).

(26) See for the Ashdod affair TADMOR, "Sargon II", 79-84, 92-93 (dating its fall to 712, as now generally accepted outside biblical studies); conveniently ANET 286-287. NB that only summary, short annalistic and a few very fragmentary detailed accounts of this campaign are available.

(27) See GALIL, "Azekah Inscription", 324-325, 328 with references. Contrast NA'AMAN, "Kings of Assyria", 246.

(28) Line 5' apparently describes Azekah as "located between my [la]nd [ašrija] and the land of Judah". See GALIL, "Azekah Inscription", 322-323. Contrast unconvincingly on *ašrija* (admittedly using a more common translation) NA'AMAN, "Kings of Assyria", 246.

campaign, which depict Ashdod as a kingdom. In contrast, this situation agrees with that initially created by the Ashdod campaign, as presumably described by the original Azekah text in an Ashdod section placed *before* the Judaeen section<sup>(29)</sup>. Stylistic evidence strongly supports setting the Azekah text in 712, as this text is “especially close” to a text set in 714 and “very similar” to a text set in 710<sup>(30)</sup>.

The Azekah text’s detailed account of border operations in the Shephelah is very consistent with the limited, Shephelah-oriented campaign against Judah that seems indicated by 2 Kgs 18,14-16 (when separated from 2 Kgs 18,13b; 18,17–19,37) and Isa 22,1-14. The personal involvement of the Assyrian king provides another point of agreement between 2 Kgs 18,14-16 and the Azekah text, in which such involvement appears guaranteed by the detailed nature of this text<sup>(31)</sup>, but poses a stumbling-block for the setting of either text in 712: according to the generally relied-on Eponym Chronicle, Sargon II stayed “in the land” (Assyria) in 712<sup>(32)</sup>. Moreover, Isa 20,1 ascribes the capture of Ashdod to a subordinate of Sargon II. However if 2 Kgs 18,14-16 is indeed set in 712, as occasionally suggested<sup>(33)</sup>, Sargon II could very well simply have been at the great Judaeen fortress of Lachish (v. 14), commanding the assault on the most important rebel state, when his officer captured Ashdod. More importantly, Sargon II’s claim to have led the Ashdod campaign in person — a common Assyrian royal conceit — appears to be confirmed (an overlooked and seemingly crucial point) by the make-up of the invasion force, which consisted solely of the Assyrian *royal guard*. Sargon II’s account can be harmonized with the Eponym Chronicle evidence by supposing that the Ashdod campaign remained outside the scope of this text due to the *limited*

(29) Cf. the geographical sequence in Sennacherib’s records of the 701 campaign and see GALIL, “Azekah Inscription”, 327-328.

(30) See respectively N. NA’AMAN, “Sennacherib’s ‘Letter to God’ on his Campaign to Judah”, *BASOR* 214 (1974) 29; TADMOR, “Sargon II”, 99.

(31) See e.g. NA’AMAN, “Sennacherib’s Campaign”, 61; GALIL, “Azekah Inscription”, 324 for the level of detail in the original Azekah text.

(32) See e.g. A.R. MILLARD, *Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910-612 BC* (Helsinki 1994) 47, 60 for the 712 Eponym Chronicle entry.

(33) See e.g. the references given by H.H. ROWLEY, “Hezekiah’s Reform and Rebellion”, *BJRL* 44 (1961/62) 413-414, n. 8; also C. STEDL, “Textkritische Bemerkungen zu den Synchronismen der Könige von Israel und Juda”, *VT* 12 (1962) 115-116; A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Micha* (Nijkerk 1977) 16.

*mobilization* involved: "In a sudden rage, I did not (wait to) assemble the full might of my army or to prepare the camp(ing equipment), but started out towards Ashdod (only) with those of my warriors who, even in friendly areas, never leave my side".

Many chronological considerations and historical parallels support dating the Assyrian campaign in year 14 of Hezekiah to 712<sup>(34)</sup>. Chronologically, this dating agrees perfectly with chronographic reckoning back from the death of Josiah in 609<sup>(35)</sup>.

<sup>(34)</sup> For arguments against such a high dating of Hezekiah (i.e. from c.725), see e.g. E.R. THIELE, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (Grand Rapids 1983) 168-171; A.F. RAINEY, review of BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, *JSS* 39 (1994) 324. Most objections are easily met. E.g.: Hezekiah's early access to the northern kingdom and his messengers' mention of deportations by Assyrian 'kings' (2 Chr 30,1.6.10-11, cf. 29,3 for dating) can be satisfactorily related to 2 Kgs 15,29; 17,2 and (hypothetically) 17,3 (alternatively, 2 Chr 30,6's 'kings' could be conventional [cf. 2 Chr 32,4]). A recent objection (NA'AMAN, "Kings of Assyria", 238) that the high dating places Hezekiah's death (unreported by Sennacherib) before the reported death of Lulli of Sidon ignores Lulli's failure (unlike Hezekiah) to submit to Sennacherib after the 701 campaign. For a further objection, arising from earlier biblical chronology, see §5 below.

The high dating of Hezekiah does entail almost incredibly short generations from Jotham to Hezekiah. However: (1) This tight situation arises strictly from a straightforward reading of 2 Kgs 15,27.30.32-33; 18,1-2. (2) 2 Chr 28,7 tells of the death during the Syro-Ephraimite crisis (i.e. c.734) of a "king's son" who can extremely naturally be taken as a son of Ahaz (cf. 2 Kgs 15,5). This situation (i.e. Hezekiah's brother being of military age c.734), and the equally tight situation created by Hezekiah's accession c.725 at the age of 25 (2 Kgs 18,2), corroborate each other.

<sup>(35)</sup> See GALIL, *Chronology*, 103-104. Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon and Josiah are given respectively 29, 55, 2 and 31 years, while the death of Josiah is generally (following H. TADMOR, "Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah", *JNES* 15 [1966] 228) and extremely plausibly dated to the summer of 609. Assuming rounding off of Judaeen regnal year totals (next paragraph), plus postdating and no coregencies in Judah during this period (in both cases because the alternative would force [on the basis of rounding off] a [see n. 8 above] impossibly low post-720 dating of 2 Kgs 18,10's fall of Samaria), these data date year 14 of Hezekiah to 609 + 31 + 2 + 55 + (29-14) = 712.

Rounding off of Judaeen regnal year totals is very widely accepted (contrast *ibid.*, 375, based on assuming antedating [*ibid.*, 372]). This convention can be straightforwardly derived (cf. J. McHUGH, "The Date of Hezekiah's Birth", *VT* 14 [1964] 451) from a combination of 2 Kgs 17,1 (Hoshea acceded in year 12 of Ahaz), 2 Kgs 18,1 (Hezekiah acceded in year 3 of Hoshea), 2 Kgs 16,2 (Ahaz ruled 16 years) and 2 Chr 29,3 (Hezekiah reversed his father's religious policy [presumably after that king's death] shortly before Passover of his 1st year). 2 Chr 29's religious reform is commonly questioned, e.g. by

Two strong arguments for a c.712 dating of year 14 of Hezekiah could very well also point precisely to 712: (1) While the fall of Samaria — equated by 2 Kgs 18,10 with year 6 of Hezekiah — is usually dated to 722 or 723, 720 appears highly preferable (see section 3 below, following Galil). (2) As very widely accepted, Isa 14,28-32 appears to date the death of Hezekiah's predecessor Ahaz to around that of Tiglath-Pileser III, who died around the end of the Julian year 727 (see further n. 98 below).

Historically, in addition to an apparent limited Assyrian campaign against Judah (Azekah text evidence), the Ashdod affair presents further important points of contact with 2 Kgs 20 and Isa 22<sup>(36)</sup>: (1) cf. the otherwise peculiarly late start of Hezekiah's defensive preparations in Isa 22,8-11 (and 2 Chr 32,2-5) with Sargon II's quick response to conspiracy in 712; (2) cf. 2 Kgs 20,12-13's apparently *post*-invasion intrigue involving Marduk-apla-iddina II with this Babylonian king's presumable involvement in anti-Assyrian conspiracies between an offensive which he launched in 712 (clearly against Assyria) and his overthrow by Assyria in 710<sup>(37)</sup>. Very strong

---

M. DELCOR, "Le récit de la célébration de la Pâque au temps d'Ezéchias d'après 2 Chr 30 et ses problèmes", *Studien zu Opfer und Kult im Alten Testament* (Hrsg. A. SCHENKER) (Tübingen 1992) 100-106 (concerning historicity); M. COGAN, "The Chronicler's Use of Chronology as Illuminated by Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions", *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J.H. TIGAY) (Philadelphia 1985) 198-203 (concerning dating). But it seems extremely unlikely that its often-chronological irregularities and makeshifts have been invented (cf. e.g. R.H. LOWERY, *Reforming Kings: Cults and Society in First Temple Judah* [JSOTSS 120; Sheffield 1991] 162-167; contrast unconvincingly e.g. DELCOR, "Pâque", 105-106). Cogan dismisses 2 Chr 29,3's dating of the start of Hezekiah's reform (the 1st day of Nisan [= the 1st month] in his 1st year) as idealizing antedating (COGAN, "Use of Chronology", 203, n. 21). But this ignores the use of such symbolism in life as well as literature!

For a second argument that Judaeon regnal years were rounded off, cf. 2 Kgs 18,2.13a; 20,1.6.

<sup>(36)</sup> See HAYES – IRVINE, *Eighth Century Prophet*, 267-287, 383-386. Also e.g.: GINSBERG, "Reflexes", 47-49 with n. 4; OSWALT, *Book of Isaiah*, 407-408 (for Isa 22,1-14); the references cited by WILLIS, "Historical Issues", 68-69, n. 28 (for Isa 22,15-23[24]); the references cited by NA'AMAN, "Kings of Assyria", 244 (for 2 Kgs 20).

<sup>(37)</sup> For Marduk-apla-iddina II's offensive in 712, see Babylonian Chronicle 1.i.43-44 (A.K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* [TCS 5; Locust Valley 1975] 75). Cf. i.41-42; ii.1-5 for this offensive clearly targeted at Assyria. For sources on Marduk-apla-iddina's overthrow in 710, see TADMOR, "Sargon II", 96.



support for Babylonian plotting with the *west* around this time is provided by the extremely weak role played by Nubia and Egypt during and after the Ashdod affair<sup>(38)</sup>. The ability of Babylonia to launch an offensive against Assyria in 712 and not be overcome until 710 also fits very well with Hezekiah's apparently strong *post*-invasion position in 2 Kgs 20,12-13 (and 2 Chr 32,23)<sup>(39)</sup>.

As noted by Hayes and Irvine, dating Isa 22 to 712 finds further support from its contiguity to chapters 20–21: a) Isa 20 explicitly refers to the Ashdod affair (v. 1); b) Isa 21, which has a wide variety of links to Isa 22<sup>(40)</sup>, prophesies against Babylon (vv. 1-10). If dated to the Assyrian period, this presumably reflects Babylonian participation in anti-Assyrian plotting with Judah<sup>(41)</sup>, as all but certain *c.*712.

Dating Isa 21,1-10 to the Assyrian period is often rejected, based on v. 2's reference to "Elam" and "Medes" fighting (to all appearances) *against* Babylon — i.e. (on such a dating) serving as a euphemism for an Assyrian attack<sup>(42)</sup>. However the use of such a euphemism *c.*712-710 is paralleled remarkably closely by Isa 22's reference to only "Elam" and "Kir" (v. 6) as participants in what is *clearly* (cf. vv. 8-11 with 2 Chr 32,2-5; also n.16 above) an Assyrian attack on Hezekiah (section 2 so far: to all appearances in 712). Since good numbers of foreigners, apparently including Iranians, appear to have served in the Assyrian royal guard<sup>(43)</sup>, the mobilization of only the royal guard in 712 could help greatly in explaining this extremely surprising (but apparently clear) euphemism.

Dating Isa 21,1-10 to *c.*712-710, as increasingly widely

<sup>(38)</sup> After failing (along with Egypt) to intervene in 712, Nubia eventually extradited the Ashdodite rebel leader Yamani to Assyria (see n. 26 above).

<sup>(39)</sup> This background largely vitiates an objection to §1's reconstruction, that Hezekiah's strong diplomatic position in 2 Chr 32,23 seems unlikely to have followed 2 Kgs 18,14-16's surrender on terms.

<sup>(40)</sup> See e.g. OSWALT, *Book of Isaiah*, 406; C.R. SEITZ, *Isaiah 1–39* (IBC; Louisville 1993) 158.

<sup>(41)</sup> Cf. e.g. Isa 14,28-32 and, in light of Sargon II's reference to Judaeans involvement in the Ashdod affair, Isa 20,1-6.

<sup>(42)</sup> So e.g. J. DAY, review of A.A. MACINTOSH, *Isaiah xxi: A Palimpsest*, *JTS* 34 (1983) 214. Contrast unconvincingly e.g. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1–39*, 281.

<sup>(43)</sup> See e.g. J.E. READE, "The Neo-Assyrian Court and Army: Evidence from the Sculptures", *Iraq* 34 (1972) 107; S. STOHLMANN, "The Judaeans Exile after 701 B.C.E.", *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method* (eds. W.W. HALLO et al.) (Winona Lake 1983) 163-164.

accepted<sup>(44)</sup>, has the important advantage of explaining vv. 3-4's otherwise problematic trembling over the fall of Babylon<sup>(45)</sup> by its implications for late 8<sup>th</sup> century Judah — i.e. by Isaiah's recognition (in spite of his aversion to foreign alliances!) of the giant step which this would represent towards Assyrian fulfillment of Yahweh's terrible plan for Judah (cf. v. 10's reference to threshing). This explanation is strongly supported by Isa 20's apparent confirmation of the fearful significance of the fall of Babylon to Isaiah: taken straightforwardly, this text indicates that Isaiah walked around naked for "three years", starting in the year of Ashdod's fall — i.e. from 712 to 710 (reckoning inclusively) — before the explanation was given by Yahweh that this behavior symbolized the coming overthrow of Levantine and Nilotic opposition to Assyria. This nakedness also provides Isa 22 with a further connection to 712 as Isa 22,6.8.14 all refer to uncovering.

### 3. Dating the Fall of Samaria to 720 / Year 6 of Hezekiah

In recent years, the fall of Samaria has been the most intensively discussed subject in later 8<sup>th</sup> century biblical history and chronology. The proposal of most interest here is Galil's identification of the biblical fall of Samaria, i.e. the conquest recounted by 2 Kgs 17,6; 18,10 (and dated to year 6 of Hezekiah by 2 Kgs 18,10), with its known fall to Sargon II in 720<sup>(46)</sup>. This fits perfectly chronologically with both the death of Josiah in 609 and the apparent dating of year 14 of Hezekiah to 712.

Preferring this identification to a hypothetical capture of Samaria in 722 or 723 is further supported by the following considerations.

It seems extremely unlikely that the crushing of a subsequent revolt in 720 would have merited the great pride which Sargon II later, after many great victories, took in his conquest of Samaria, as

<sup>(44)</sup> See e.g. HAYES – IRVINE, *Eighth Century Prophet*, 274-276; SEITZ, *Isaiah 1-39*, 157-159. Cf. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1-39*, 279-283. Contrast e.g. DAY, review of MACINTOSH, *Palimpsest*, 212-215.

<sup>(45)</sup> This trembling fits very poorly with the usual dating of Isa 21,1-10 to the 6th century, when Babylon was a much-hated foe. [Use of Hab 3,16 as a parallel (e.g. by DAY, review of MACINTOSH *Palimpsest*, 213-214) fails because Hab 3 (unlike Isa 21,1-10) otherwise celebrates as Yahweh's victory the events which it describes].

<sup>(46)</sup> See GALIL, "Last Years", 61-62. So also — apart from the synchronism with Hezekiah — LAATO, "New Viewpoints", 217-219; NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 218-222.

indicated by its “central position in Sargon’s inscriptions composed in his later years”<sup>(47)</sup>.

2 Kgs 17,4-6 and 18,9-11 know nothing of a double capture of the Israelite capital. While the possibility that 2 Kgs 17,4-6 has telescoped together two distinct Assyrian captures of Samaria is supported by 2 Kgs 17,3-6’s implicit conflation of two distinct Assyrian kings<sup>(48)</sup>, a seemingly clearly *much* less important earlier campaign by Shalmaneser *is* noted separately (2 Kgs 17,3)<sup>(49)</sup>.

It seems especially unlikely that the end of Israelite history in 720 (after which Samaria appears in Assyrian sources as a province and the scene of large-scale deportations) would have been ignored by biblical writers in favor of a temporary capture of the capital a few years earlier.

Two widely accepted but unconvincing arguments against dating the biblical fall of Samaria to 720 depend on identifying the Assyrian king involved as Shalmaneser V (726-722)<sup>(50)</sup>: (1) This ruler’s devastation of *šam/bara’in* (Babylonian Chronicle 1.i.28) is very

(47) See NA’AMAN, “Historical Background”, 208 for the preceding argument. Cf. *ibid.* for the following argument.

(48) See likewise e.g. BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 392 (compare and contrast below including nn. 53-56).

(49) While 2 Kgs 17,3’s campaign by Shalmaneser has often been considered a doublet of v. 5, this lacks textual justification (see e.g. NA’AMAN, “Historical Background”, 213; HAYES – KUAN, “Final Years”, 160, n. 17; BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 50) and produces highly questionable results (see e.g. GALIL, “Last Years”, 52-53). A campaign against Israel early in the reign of Shalmaneser V fits very well with known Assyrian campaigns in Phoenicia at this time (Josephus, *Ant.*, 9.283-287; cf. the second paragraph of n. 52 below) — undermining any attempt (e.g. by GALIL, “Last Years”, 62-63) to reject 2 Kgs 17,3 as its author’s invention.

(50) Supplemental arguments for Shalmaneser V’s capture of Samaria arise from the limited booty reported for 720 and Sargon II’s usual suggestion that his conquest came in response to a new anti-Assyrian conspiracy (implying in turn that Shalmaneser had himself finished what he started in 2 Kgs 18,9 and [implicitly] 2 Kgs 17,5). However, the first of these objections can be met by noting the expenses of the long revolt and the second seems over-rigid. Moreover, one broken text (written soon after the events of 720) quite likely originally stated explicitly (with NA’AMAN, “Historical Background”, 209-210 and many other writers) that the Samarian conspiracy had begun under Sargon II’s predecessor (although note BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 29, n. 29). The best alternative (with HAYES – KUAN, “Final Years”, 171-178) seems to be a statement that the Samaritans “came to an agreement” with an (Israelite) king. However this wording is implausible and the existence of such a necessarily post-Hoshean king is unlikely on negative biblical and Assyrian evidence.

widely set in 723 or 722, referred to a Babylonian rendering of an Aramaean form of the Hebrew for Samaria, שַׁמְרִין (cf. Ezra 4,10: שַׁמְרִין), and understood as a reference to the biblical fall of Samaria<sup>(51)</sup>. With Na'aman and many earlier writers, however, this devastation appears clearly datable to the accession year of Shalmaneser V (mentioned in i.27-28), i.e. the winter of 726<sup>(52)</sup>. (2) 2 Kgs 18,9 states

---

Sargon II's failure to recognize any successor of Hoshea can theoretically be explained (ibid., 174; cf. 165-166, 169) by Shalmaneser V's prior provincialization of Samaria (which would also help justify [together with attendant deportations] the still widely accepted equation of 2 Kgs 17-18's definitive fall of Samaria with its temporary conquest by Shalmaneser). But this seems extremely unlikely due to Sargon II's great pride (see above with n. 47) over his Samarian victory.

(<sup>51</sup>) So TADMOR, "Sargon II", 39-40, recently followed in general by e.g. HAYES – KUAN, "Final Years", 158-159; BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 24.

(<sup>52</sup>) See NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 210-211. This precise dating follows (pace e.g. HAYES – KUAN, "Final Years", 158-159; BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 24; GALIL, "Last Years", 59 point [1]) from simply understanding the entry in Babylonian Chronicle 1.i.24-28 as the record of a single year — an understanding clearly required for Babylonian Chronicle 1 entries with essentially the same format covering accession years of kings of Babylon in 722 (see i.29-32, noting that New Year's Day in Babylonia was reckoned as the last day of the old year) and 694 (see ii.36-45 and cf. the date in ii.46). [See GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 73, 78 for these entries and J.A. BRINKMAN, *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia*, 1158-722 B.C. (AnOr 43; Rome 1968) 241, n. 1517 concerning the Babylonian new year]. The claim that i.28's reference to *šam/bara'in* was originally an "undated notice" (BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 24) is very weak, as i.6-8; iii.16-18 (GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 71, 80) explicitly note undated material.

The apparently unavoidable dating of *šam/bara'in*'s destruction to the winter of 726 does raise a historical problem (cf. e.g. HAYES – KUAN, "Final Years", 160-161; BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 24-25): the city (*uru*) of Samaria was clearly not destroyed at this time and even devastation (with feasibly loose Babylonian usage) of the land of Samaria (with NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 211 based on 2 Kgs 17:3) is likely incommensurate with 2 Kgs 17,3's seemingly limited first campaign against Israel by Shalmaneser V. However reading *šam/bara'in* as a form of Samaria is much less certain than usually thought: such a form remains unparalleled in either Aramaic or Akkadian and a philologically impeccable alternative is available, Sibraim between Damascus and Hamath (see e.g. W.F. ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* [Baltimore any edition] 220, n. 116). A campaign in the winter of 726 against Sibraim (or Samaria) fits excellently (a point ignored by GALIL, "Last Years", 59 point [6] in the context of Samaria) with the likely dating (so e.g. COGAN – TADMOR, *II Kings*, 198-199; NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 215) of Shalmaneser V's swiftly successful first invasion of Phoenicia (Josephus, *Ant.*, 9.283-285) to just this time (presumably [with e.g.

that “Shalmaneser” began a siege of Samaria which 2 Kgs 17,5-6 suggests was started and ended by one and the same king — presumably Shalmaneser, who is mentioned in v. 3<sup>(53)</sup>. However it is hardly possible (unless the above suggestion [or the above statement and presumption] is rejected) to avoid conflation of two Assyrian kings in 2 Kgs 17,5-6 (on any chronology): These verses suggest just as strongly that the king who started the siege of Samaria was responsible for the main round of Assyrian deportations from Samaria. But Sargon II is well-substantiated in this role, whereas such a role for Shalmaneser V is purely speculative — and appears highly unlikely in view of the very important role played by Samaria in the resistance to Assyria in 720<sup>(54)</sup>. The likelihood that 2 Kgs 17,5-6 has conflated two distinct Assyrian kings is strongly reinforced by a comparison with 2 Kgs 18,9-11, which provides the only explicit reference to Shalmaneser after the early reign of Hoshea<sup>(55)</sup> and does *not* imply that he completed the siege of Samaria. Very plausibly to the contrary, it states only that “they took it”<sup>(56)</sup>.

On the preceding basis, Shalmaneser’s invasion of Israel in year 4 of Hezekiah (so explicitly 2 Kgs 18,9) would be dated to 722, consistent with the death of Shalmaneser V around the end of this Julian year. The lengthy ensuing siege of Samaria (probably an oversimplification) would then be dated to 722-720, fitting very well with Assyrian difficulties during this period<sup>(57)</sup>.

---

HAYES – KUAN, “Final Years”, 159-161] as the continuation of plausibly-indicated campaigning in this region during the latest reign of Tiglath-Pileser III). Babylonian reference to Shalmaneser V’s destruction of the obscure Sibraim can be simply explained by his status as king of Babylon (and evident failure to achieve any more notable feat during this winter campaign).

(<sup>53</sup>) See similarly e.g. HAYES – KUAN, “Final Years”, 165, n. 26 (arguing just from 2 Kgs 17,3-6).

(<sup>54</sup>) For the roles played by Sargon II, Shalmaneser V and Samaria, see respectively Laato, Galil and Na’aman (n. 8 above), Hayes and Kuan (n. 50 above), and above with n. 47.

(<sup>55</sup>) Cf. n. 49 above on 2 Kgs 17,3.

(<sup>56</sup>) Cf. BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 52 on 2 Kgs 18,10’s “they”. With e.g. HAYES – KUAN, “Final Years”, 166, n. 27; BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 51-53; GALIL, “Last Years”, 59 point (5), 62 against NA’AMAN, “Historical Background”, 222, there is no reason to consider 2 Kgs 18,9-12 an inferior source to 2 Kgs 17,3-6. See also above with nn. 8-9 on Sargon II’s absence from 2 Kgs 17,6; 18,10.

(<sup>57</sup>) See similarly GALIL, “Last Years”, 60-61. Cf. LAATO, “New Viewpoints”, 217. Compare and contrast NA’AMAN, “Historical Background”, 221, n. 45; BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 56.

#### 4. Dating the Reign of Hoshea to 729-720

A possible problem for dating the biblical fall of Samaria to 720 arises from its dating in Israelite terms to the 9<sup>th</sup> year of Hoshea (2 Kgs 17,6; 18,10)<sup>(58)</sup>. A dating of this regnal year to 720 is universally considered too late due to Assyrian evidence bearing on Hoshea's accession-date. However this supposedly decisive argument<sup>(59)</sup> appears to be a baseless relic of earlier views: Originally it seemed natural to date the overthrow of Hoshea's predecessor, Pekah, to the later part of the highly successful Syro-Palestinian campaign carried out by Pekah's foe, Tiglath-Pileser III, between 734 and 732. This dating appeared to be confirmed by two annalistic texts of Tiglath-Pileser (Summ. 4; Summ. 13), which refer to this campaign just before the death of Pekah. Moreover one of these texts has tribute from Hoshea sent to Tiglath-Pileser on campaign (Summ. 4:17'-19'), which was naturally taken as a reference to the same campaign. However these texts are now both understood to be summary inscriptions<sup>(60)</sup>. And it is now generally accepted, on the basis of a collation published by Borger and Tadmor in 1982, that Summ. 9:r.11 (in a broken passage which this text's geographic sequence rather clearly refers to Hoshea) places reception of the above tribute at "Sarrabanu" in *southern Babylonia*<sup>(61)</sup>.

This roundabout sending of tribute to Assyria by way of Babylonia can best be explained (with most scholars)<sup>(62)</sup> as a non-routine measure associated with Hoshea's takeover. Since *some* connection between Tiglath-Pileser's Syro-Palestinian campaign and Hoshea's takeover is still very widely thought desirable<sup>(63)</sup>, and Tiglath-Pileser personally

<sup>(58)</sup> This dating is frequently criticized (e.g. by NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 211; implicitly H. TADMOR, *Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III* [Jerusalem 1994] 277) due to Hoshea's capture (2 Kgs 17,4) before the *start* of the siege of Samaria (2 Kgs 17,5: in year 7 of Hoshea). However his evident (n. 50 above) lack of a successor makes it very likely that Hoshea's regnal years were simply recognized in absentia down to the fall of Samaria.

<sup>(59)</sup> So emphatically GALIL, "Last Years", 63 with n. 38. See also e.g. TADMOR, "Sargon II", 37; BECKING, *Fall of Samaria*, 56.

<sup>(60)</sup> TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 198-199. See also NA'AMAN, "Chronological Notes", 71-74; HAYES – KUAN, "Final Years", 154-156.

<sup>(61)</sup> See R. BORGER – H. TADMOR, "Zwei Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft aufgrund der Inschriften Tiglatpileasers III", ZAW 94 (1982) 244-249.

<sup>(62)</sup> So e.g. BORGER – TADMOR, "Zwei Beiträge", 249; NA'AMAN, "Chronological Notes", 73-74; HAYES – KUAN, "Final Years", 155. Contrast TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 277-278.

<sup>(63)</sup> Cf. e.g. HAYES – KUAN, "Final Years", 156; TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 277-278.

campaigned in southern Babylonia in 731, Hoshea's tribute is universally dated to this year. However Tiglath-Pileser also campaigned in this region personally in 729<sup>(64)</sup>, which appears *equally* possible for the sending of tribute to Sarribanu<sup>(65)</sup>: according to Tadmor<sup>(66)</sup>, Sarribanu was "taken in 731-729, after a prolonged siege"! Nor is there any real argument for linking Pekah's demise to the 734-732 campaign: the broken context of the apparent reference of Summ. 13:18' to the elimination of Pekah appears (in view of an Assyrian parallel) to confirm 2 Kgs 15,30's depiction of his death as a purely Israelite affair<sup>(67)</sup>, and he could extremely plausibly have survived the Assyrian onslaught due to the outbreak of a very serious Babylonian revolt towards the end of the 734-732 campaign<sup>(68)</sup>. Indeed such survival appears to be *indicated* by Summ. 13:17'-18' (so already G. Smith; recently Na'aman)<sup>(69)</sup>: these lines refer to "campaigns" against Israel that "spared Samaria" *in an aside referring to an earlier period*, followed immediately in the main narrative by an apparent reference to the assassination of Pekah (so e.g. both Na'aman and Tadmor)<sup>(70)</sup>.

Dating Hoshea's tribute (apparently connected with his takeover) to 729 would highly likely date his accession to this year as well<sup>(71)</sup>.

<sup>(64)</sup> Babylonian Chronicle 1.i.19-23 (GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 72)

<sup>(65)</sup> Contrast explicitly HAYES – KUAN, "Final Years", 156.

<sup>(66)</sup> TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 161, note to line 15

<sup>(67)</sup> See *ibid.*, 202-203.

<sup>(68)</sup> See e.g. J.A. BRINKMAN, *Prelude to Empire: Babylonian Society and Politics, 747-626 B.C.* (Philadelphia 1984) 42-43 for this revolt.

<sup>(69)</sup> See G. SMITH, "On a New Fragment of the Assyrian Canon Belonging to the Reign of Tiglath-Pileser and Shalmaneser", *TSBA* 2 (1873) 323; NA'AMAN, "Chronological Notes", 72.

<sup>(70)</sup> See NA'AMAN, "Chronological Notes", 72; TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 202-203.

<sup>(71)</sup> Theoretically, the receipt of Hoshea's initial tribute could be dated early in 729, with his accession late in 730. However, biblical data clearly entail a short interregnum between Pekah and Hoshea: cf. 2 Kgs 15,27.30.32 (see below following n. 96: implying that Pekah died, in the same Judaeen regnal year as Hoshea's accession, between the Judaeen and Israelite royal new years) with 2 Kgs 16,2; 17,1; 18,1 in light of 2 Chr 29,3 (cf. MCHUGH, "Hezekiah's Birth", 451; n. 35 above: implying that Hoshea acceded between the Israelite and Judaeen royal new years). Since there is no evidence for internal opposition to Hoshea at the start of his reign, this delay on his part in taking the throne should presumably be understood as prudent deference to Tiglath-Pileser III — agreeing excellently with the latter's claim to have "installed Hoshea [as king]" (Summ. 4:17'-18'). This scenario greatly minimizes the chance that an Assyrian new year passed between Hoshea's accession and the receipt of his initial tribute at Sarribanu.

An accession-date of 729 for Hoshea would date his 9<sup>th</sup> year, very attractively, to the *known* fall of Samaria in 720 (so already Smith)<sup>(72)</sup> — *if* the chronographic data for Hoshea are based on postdating. Such usage *does* appear to be indicated (assuming no changes in chronographic conventions during this period) by a combination of data involving Hoshea (whose reign for 9 years [2 Kgs 17,1] presumably ended with the fall of Samaria in his 9<sup>th</sup> year) and Menahem (who acceded in year 39 of Uzziah and ruled 10 years, but died in year 50 of Uzziah [2 Kgs 15,17.23]): The evidence involving Hoshea implies that Israelite regnal year totals from this period have been rounded off (as very widely accepted). This makes Menahem's 10<sup>th</sup> year his last, implying that it overlapped with year 50 of Uzziah. This is only possible (in view of the year 39 datum) if Menahem used postdating<sup>(73)</sup>.

In short: rather than impeaching sections 2-3's argument for dating the biblical fall of Samaria to 720, 2 Kgs 17,6; 18,10's Israelite synchronisms fit extremely well with this dating.

## 5. Dating the Death of Menahem to 743 and Later 8<sup>th</sup> Century Biblical Chronology

The high dating of Hezekiah's accession (c.727-725) can be criticized for entailing (on the basis of biblical data) a triple overlap among Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz<sup>(74)</sup>. Lowering the date of Pekah's replacement by Hoshea (cf. 2 Kgs 15,30; 17,1: in year 20 of Jotham / year 12 of Ahaz) from c.731 to 729 minimizes this difficulty by dating Ahaz's accession to 741 or 740 (rather than slightly earlier). But since Menahem died in year 50 of Uzziah and Uzziah reigned for 52 years (2 Kgs 15,2.23), the fit remains too tight (cf. Fig.1 below) unless Menahem's death can be dated to 743<sup>(75)</sup>. This conflicts with a currently accepted upper limit of 738<sup>(76)</sup>.

<sup>(72)</sup> SMITH, "New Fragment", 323-324.

<sup>(73)</sup> See MCHUGH, "Hezekiah's Birth", 448.

<sup>(74)</sup> So e.g. E.R. THIELE, "Pekah to Hezekiah", VT 16 (1966) 102. This objection can be avoided by rejecting (e.g.) 2 Kgs 15,32 and making Jotham a predeceased coregent of Uzziah.

<sup>(75)</sup> An earlier date would also fit in this regard, but Menahem's synchronism with Tiglath-Pileser III (2 Kgs 15,19) cannot precede the latter's first western campaign in 743.

<sup>(76)</sup> See recently on this upper limit (too low for the MT of 2 Kgs 15,1) TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 274; also NA'AMAN, "Chronological Notes", 81-82



As with Hoshea, however, evidence was published a few decades ago that confirms the very real possibility of the necessary redating of Menahem. Previously, debate had centered on the setting of two Assyrian tribute-lists, Ann. 13\*:10-14\*:2 — which contained the only known report of tribute from Menahem in an annalistic text (Ann. 13\*:10) — and Ann. 21:4'-9'(<sup>77</sup>). The Ann. 13\*-14\* list is immediately followed by the start of an account of Tiglath-Pileser's 737 campaign and immediately preceded by an account of the aftermath of a campaign against Azriyau (continued from Ann. 19\*). The Azriyau campaign is very widely (following Tadmor) and very plausibly dated to 738, based on: (1) its immediately pre-737 position, and (2) resettlement in the course of this campaign of Ulluba (Ann. 19\*:12) and Unqi (Ann. 13\*:4-5), the conquests of which are highlighted by the Eponym Chronicle entries for 739 and 738, respectively(<sup>78</sup>). On this basis, the Ann. 13\*-14\* list per se appears to be set in 738 (*pace* Thiele(<sup>79</sup>): 743).

However the assumption of a like dating for the entire *contents* of this list can no longer be relied on, due to evidence from an annalistic Iran stele published in 1972-73(<sup>80</sup>). This text concludes, following a break, with a geographical summary of Tiglath-Pileser's conquests, an account of a still on-going 737 campaign, and a

---

with references. The MT of 2 Kgs 15,1 has been rejected (e.g. by GALIL, *Chronology*, 60, n. 47) based on its supposed contradiction by 1 Chr 5,17's statement that the Transjordanian genealogies given by vv. 3-16 were written down "in the days of Jotham king of Judah and in the days of Jeroboam king of Israel" [literal translation]. However a synchronism between Jeroboam II and Jotham would contradict the latter's synchronisms with Pekah in 2 Kgs 15,30.32 (which are hardly calculated in view of their [see below following n. 96] *seeming* slight numerical discordance) and the supposed synchronism in 1 Chr 5,17 can be avoided by referring this verse to two distinct censuses (as is very consistent with its language and summary nature). A post-Jeroboam II Transjordanian census dated under Jotham agrees with his supremacy over the Ammonites in 2 Chr 27,5. Since Pekah was apparently based in Gilead (2 Kgs 15,25), this strong position of Jotham surely entails his simultaneous role as suzerain (or ally) of Pekah — agreeing excellently with 2 Kgs 15,32's surprising dating of Jotham's accession in terms of Pekah's regnal years as (see below at nn. 92-94) *counter-king*.

(<sup>77</sup>) See TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 54-59 for Ann. 21+25; *ibid.*, 66-71 for Ann. 13\*-14\*.

(<sup>78</sup>) See *ibid.*, 274-276 with references.

(<sup>79</sup>) Contrast THIELE, *Mysterious Numbers*, 139-162.

(<sup>80</sup>) See TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 92-110, 260-264.

tribute-list (including Menahem) which is clearly<sup>(81)</sup> a composite involving tribute from more than one year (Stele III A 1-30). This evidence makes a composite list in Ann. 13\* -14\* very attractive by providing: (1) a clear parallel, set just one year later, for the use of a composite tribute-list in an annalistic text, and (2) a parallel (the stele's geographic summary) for a composite record immediately preceding an account of the 737 campaign.

Ann. 21:4'-9', together with a description of tribute which continues through Ann. 25:2', further supports this possibility by supplying what appears to be a distinct tribute-list restricted to tribute received during the 738 campaign. A setting of Ann. 21+25 in 738 / at the time of the Azriyau episode appears highly likely (see likewise Tadmor)<sup>(82)</sup> due to the *total* conquest of Unqi in Ann. 25:3'-12', as also indicated by the Eponym Chronicle entry for 738 and presumably by Ann. 13\*:4-5's resettlement of Unqi for the Azriyau episode. But the broken tribute-list in Ann. 21,4'-9' (not [now] naming Menahem or Samaria) was considerably shorter (even originally) than the list in Ann. 13\*:10-14\*:2, treats Rezin separately and in much more detail, is specified as dealing with tribute received in Arpad, and was apparently followed immediately (after a description of the tribute in question) by a reference to another campaign in the same year (rather than by a year-break)<sup>(83)</sup>. *All* of these factors support a distinction between the Ann. 21+25 list as an original record of tribute received in 738 and the Ann. 13\*-14\* list (which includes all extant tributaries from the Ann. 21+25 list) as a composite.

Even more surprising than the composite nature of the Iran stele list (set in 737) is its probable reflection, in part, of an *earlier* situation than the Ann. 13\*-14\* list (set in 738)<sup>(84)</sup>. This further substantiates the existence of chronological laxness in tribute-lists attached to annalistic texts (as required for a 743 dating of Menahem's death). On the other hand, this situation indicates that the Ann. 13\*-14\* list (including Menahem) *has* been updated. However this updating involved (as far as known) only replacement of a vassal by his successor as vassal and addition of a new vassal

<sup>(81)</sup> See *ibid.*, 263.

<sup>(82)</sup> See *ibid.*, 219-220.

<sup>(83)</sup> See *ibid.*, 54-59, 265, Plate XXIV. Ann. 21:4'-9' has one lacuna that *might* (cf. *ibid.*, 265) have originally contained Menahem's name and country.

<sup>(84)</sup> See e.g. *ibid.*, 266-268 for this probable understanding.

— not omission or blatant falsification, as would presumably have been necessary for updating in the case of Israel<sup>(85)</sup> and could very well have been considered undesirable.

Other biblical evidence probably bears directly on the dating of Menahem's reported tribute. 2 Kgs 15,19 tells of a voluntary payment from Menahem to Tiglath-Pileser, "so that he would support him in holding on to the kingdom"<sup>(86)</sup>. This was associated with Tiglath-Pileser's personal (albeit transitory) presence in Israel (vv. 19-20). Since the Eponym Chronicle appears to indicate military paralysis in northern Syria in 743 (see just below), followed by north Syrian conflict with Assyria or Tiglath-Pileser's involvement elsewhere until 734 (the start of his Syro-Palestinian campaign, which postdates Menahem on both Assyrian and biblical evidence), a personal intervention by Tiglath-Pileser III in Menahem's favor appears best dated to 743. The key point concerning this year is that the principal Urartian defeat occurred in Kummukh, clearly to the north of Arpad. As a result, the Eponym Chronicle entry for 743 appears to be clearly readable as a double entry: "In Arpad. A defeat was inflicted on Urartu"<sup>(87)</sup>. The contrast with entries for 742-740, each including "Against Arpad.", is widely taken to rule out this reading<sup>(88)</sup>, but very plausibly simply reflects *temporary* paralysis of north Syrian resistance to Assyria following the great Assyrian victory over Urartu in 743.

To be sure, the tribute from Menahem reported in Assyrian sources could be later than that recounted by 2 Kgs 15,19-20 (a possibility mooted by Tadmor)<sup>(89)</sup>. However a more economical solution is supported — especially in view of the lack of other Palestinian tributaries in this early period — by the evident backfire of Menahem's Assyrian policy: After describing the very onerous taxation required to pay for Tiglath-Pileser's help, 2 Kgs 15,19-20 is generally thought to conclude banally and cryptically: "Then (י)

<sup>(85)</sup> The anti-Assyrian Pekah was already a power in the Israelite government under Menahem's ephemeral successor, Pekahiah (2 Kgs 15,25).

<sup>(86)</sup> See e.g. COGAN – TADMOR, *II Kings*, 169-170, 172 for this clearly indicated understanding.

<sup>(87)</sup> So M.C. ASTOUR, "The Arena of Tiglath-Pileser III's Campaign against Sarduri II (743 B.C.)", *Assur* 2/3 (1979) 8; likewise MILLARD, *Eponyms*, 59 and most early writers. Contrast most recent writers, e.g. TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 232-233 including n. 7 (cf. just below).

<sup>(88)</sup> See e.g. H. TADMOR, "Azriyau of Yaudi", *ScrHie* 8 (1962) 254.

<sup>(89)</sup> See TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 276.

the king of Assyria withdrew and did not remain there in the country”<sup>(90)</sup>. However, translating ׀ as “but”<sup>(91)</sup> yields a straightforward account of a fiasco. This evident fiasco also fits very well with Menahem’s *death* in 743 (as required to avoid a triple overlap among Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz), since it means that 2 Kgs 15,20’s memorably onerous and so extremely plausibly *already* desperate taxation to pay off Tiglath-Pileser III bought Menahem little but ill-will from his kingdom.

This scenario for the latest reign of Menahem also allows a rather satisfactory resolution to the difficult problem of Pekah’s reign for 20 years (2 Kgs 15,27). One common solution (inconsistent with Fig. 1) is antedating on Pekah’s part (as a sheer fabrication) back to the death of Zechariah. But this begs the question of how such a fiction was perpetuated: Pekah was succeeded by his assassin Hoshea and survived by his Judaeen foe Ahaz. This fiction also has a very improbable corollary, the origin of Jotham’s accession in year 2 of Pekah (2 Kgs 15,32) as a calculated synchronism. There is no evidence for the use of such a procedure by MT<sup>(92)</sup> and such an origin appears especially unlikely for the Pekah / Jotham synchronisms due to their *seeming* slight numerical discordance with each other<sup>(93)</sup>. The principal alternative to antedating by Pekah is inclusion in his 20 years of a period as counter-king (*pace* 2 Kgs 15,27’s clearly impossible and universally rejected: “in Samaria 20 years” [literal translation]). The existence of such a rival to Menahem fits extremely well with his *voluntary* payment of a very onerous bribe for military help. The only real objection to Pekah’s counter-kingship arises from his service as an officer under Menahem’s son Pekahiah (2 Kgs 15,25) prior to assassinating him. However a pseudo-reconciliation between Pekah and Pekahiah is very plausible if Menahem died shortly after Tiglath-Pileser III’s intervention: Pekahiah would still have been heavily tainted by Menahem’s unpopular taxation and Pekah (in addition to welcoming access to Pekahiah’s person) would still have been weakened by whatever momentary help Menahem had derived from Tiglath-Pileser<sup>(94)</sup>.

<sup>(90)</sup> See COGAN – TADMOR, *II Kings*, 170 for this translation.

<sup>(91)</sup> See BDB 252 (1e) for this usage.

<sup>(92)</sup> E.R. THIELE, “The Azariah and Hezekiah Synchronisms”, *VT* 16 (1966) 105-106 is vitiated by n. 71’s interregnum (above).

<sup>(93)</sup> See below following n. 96; cf. also n. 76 above.

<sup>(94)</sup> Contrast on the problem of Pekah e.g. NA’AMAN, “Chronological Notes”, 75-81.

Since Uzziah reigned for 52 years, the suggested dating to 743-729 of the interval from the death of Menahem (in year 50 of Uzziah) to the death of Pekah / accession of Hoshea (in year 20 of Jotham / year 12 of Ahaz) could very well avoid a triple overlap of Judaeans kings. However the chronology is tight enough for the feasibility of this solution to depend on the chronological conventions in use during this period. These appear to include, in both Israel and Judah, rounding off of regnal year totals for all rulers and postdating for non-coregents<sup>(95)</sup>. To avoid a triple overlap, antedating for Judaeans coregents is also required (cf. Fig.1). With a Tishri (i.e. early fall) royal new year in Judah (which seems more likely than the alternative dating in Nisan, i.e. early spring), a brief coregency between Hezekiah and Ahaz would also be necessary<sup>(96)</sup>.

Such a coregency is unexceptional (indeed to be expected) in view of known 8<sup>th</sup> century Judaeans practice. And antedating by Judaeans coregents during this period follows from 2 Kgs 15,30.32, which separate the death of Pekah from the accession of Jotham (as universally accepted on chronological grounds, clearly during the lifetime of Uzziah) by 18 Israelite royal new years (based on rounding off for Pekah) and 19 or 20 Judaeans royal new years, depending on whether Jotham's regnal years were antedated or postdated. 18 var. 19 years for this interval requires only the accession of Jotham between the Israelite and Judaeans royal new years and the death of Pekah between the Judaeans and Israelite royal new years. But 18 var. 20 years is impossible.

The scheme of later 8<sup>th</sup> century biblical chronology arising from preceding considerations is precisely-defined<sup>(97)</sup> and discards no biblical data apart from the seemingly unavoidable recognition of

<sup>(95)</sup> See above preceding n. 73 for Israel and n. 35 above for Judah.

<sup>(96)</sup> A Nisan royal new year in Judah would allow at most a half month for the events recounted by 2 Chr 34,8-32, which are generally accepted as having occurred in Josiah's 18<sup>th</sup> year prior to Passover (= mid-Nisan). A Tishri royal new year in Judah is required for consistent usage between 2 Kgs 18,2.13a; 20,1.6 and 2 Kgs 14,2.17.23, as this is only possible if 2 Kgs 14,17 and 20,6 were calculated using a civil new year (known to have begun in Nisan) *distinct* from the royal new year (see TADMOR, "First Temple Period", 373-374 for new years used in ancient Palestine). Fig.1 is based on a Judaeans royal new year in Tishri (with a spring royal new year in Israel; for a c. 1/2 year offset very likely, cf. e.g. McHUGH, "Hezekiah's Birth", 451; text just below). If the correct date is Nisan, all events down to the accession of Hezekiah would move up by 1/2 year and no coregency would be indicated.

<sup>(97)</sup> Cf. Fig. 1; above including n. 96.

conflation between two Assyrian campaigns in 2 Kgs 18,13–19,37 etc., conflation between two Assyrian kings in 2 Kgs 17,3-6 (cf. also v. 5 with 2 Kgs 18,9), and misunderstanding of Pekah's early counter-kingship in 2 Kgs 15,27<sup>(98)</sup>.

\*\*\*

Combining a number of recent shifts in viewpoint leads towards a solution for later 8<sup>th</sup> century biblical chronology along the following lines.

<sup>(98)</sup> See respectively §1, above following n. 53, and above with nn. 92-94.

Note concerning the death of Ahaz: Isa 14,29-32, dated to "the year that king Ahaz died" (v. 28), warns Philistines not to rejoice over the broken "rod that chastised you" because their foe's offspring would be of like nature (v. 29). As very widely accepted, this appears to date Isa 14,29-32 to soon after the death of an Assyrian king who had conquered Philistia — and is clearly identifiable as Tiglath-Pileser III on chronological and historical grounds. However the immediate cause of the Philistine embassy that evidently occasioned this oracle (v. 32) was very probably the death of the anti-Philistine / pro-Assyrian Ahaz himself. And the usual significance of a broken rod in Isaiah is not specifically the death of an overlord, but rather the end of foreign (i.e. Assyrian) domination (see J.T. WILLIS, "'Rod' and 'Staff' in Isaiah 1–39", *OTEs* 3 [1990] 93-106). So if Ahaz actually died soon (but not immediately) after the death of Tiglath-Pileser III c. the end of the Julian year 727 — and Assyrian power in the west was being shaken at the same time — the concatenation of imagery in v. 29 would still be extremely appropriate. [For this dating of the death of Ahaz, cf. §§2-3 with above including n. 96. For Assyrian power shaken at this time, cf. e.g. Isa 14,28-32 itself; 2 Chr 30,1.10-11; seemingly Isa 9,3; and the probable outbreak of the principal western revolt against Shalmaneser V in 726 / early 725 (cf. e.g. COGAN – TADMOR, *II Kings*, 198-199; NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 213-216; HAYES – KUAN, "Final Years", 161).]

Note concerning Jotham's reign for 16 years (2 Kgs 15,33): In view of reference to his "20th year" (2 Kgs 15,30), and partial parallels involving Jehoiahin (Ezek 1,2) and Hoshea (cf. n. 58 above; above preceding n. 73), these 16 years very likely ended with his deposition by Assyria. This fits excellently with Fig.1's dating to the spring/summer of 733. Evidence that Ahaz was already in charge of policy in 734 (TADMOR, *Tiglath-Pileser*, 268; probably 2 Kgs 16,5-18 and Isa 7) would then indicate his creeping deposition of Jotham.

Fig.1's chronographic conventions agree with Thiele. Fig.1's dates for Uzziah and his Israelite contemporaries from Jeroboam II on are 1 year higher than Thiele. This is consistent with Thiele's scheme for the period prior to Jeroboam II and Uzziah, since Amaziah could (on Thiele's scheme for this period) as well have died in the fall of 768 / winter of 767 as in Thiele's assumed spring/summer of 767 (see e.g. THIELE, *Mysterious Numbers*, 110).

1) As recently emphasized by Seitz, the usual setting of 2 Kgs 18,14-16 in 701 cannot be justified. This means that apparent contradictions between 2 Kgs 18,14-16 and 2 Kgs 18,17-19,37 (clearly set in 701) could very well reflect confusion between two distinct Assyrian campaigns against Hezekiah.

2) Confusion with a *pre*-701 campaign is supported by the lesser nature of 2 Kgs 18,14-16's campaign, v. 13's dating to year 14 of Hezekiah (now very widely thought to precede 701), and much material in 2 Kgs 20, 2 Chr 32 and Isa 22.

3) The only datable episode that can plausibly be connected with an Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah prior to 701 involves Assyrian suppression in 712 of a plot organized by Ashdod, in which Judah was implicated. This combination appears to be substantiated by the Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah reported in the Azekah text, which appears datable to 712 (so e.g. Galil). Dating the suggested initial Assyrian campaign against Hezekiah to 712 also produces an extremely attractive concatenation involving Isa 20-22, 2 Kgs 20 and events in Babylonia between 712 and 710 (Hayes and Irvine).

4) The presence of the Assyrian king at Lachish in 2 Kgs 18,14 is very consistent with his absence from Ashdod in Isa 20,1. While 2 Kgs 18,14 disagrees with the Eponym Chronicle entry for 712: "in the land" (= Assyria), Sargon II's claim that he commanded the Ashdod campaign in person appears to be confirmed — an overlooked and seemingly crucial point — by the make-up of the invasion force, which consisted solely of the Assyrian *royal guard*. This limited mobilization presumably left the Ashdod campaign outside the scope of the Eponym Chronicle.

5) Dating year 14 of Hezekiah to 712 fits perfectly with evidence for subsequent Judaeon chronology as well as Galil's recent identification of the biblical fall of Samaria in year 6 of Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18,10) with its capture by Sargon II in 720 (so also — apart from the synchronism with Hezekiah — Laato; Na'aman).

6) An important new point is that the preceding identification makes 2 Kgs 17-18's implication that Shalmaneser was the conqueror of Samaria an error for Sargon II. This provides an excellent parallel for 2 Kgs 18,13's suggested reference to Sennacherib in error for Sargon II in connection with the campaign in 2 Kgs 18,14-16. This apparent pattern would seem to be related to Isa 14,20's hoped-for *proscription* of a tyrant who is generally identified as Sargon II.

7) 2 Kgs 18,10's parallel dating of the fall of Samaria to year 9 of Hoshea is generally thought to date this fall prior to 720. However, this view is based on tribute from Hoshea, thought datable to 731, which can equally well be dated to 729.

8) Combining even 729 for Hoshea's accession with the generally accepted upper limit of 738 for the death of Menahem entails a triple overlap among Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz. Such an overlap hardly appears feasible. However, this limit is based on Menahem's appearance in a tribute-list set in 738 which could very well be composite, as is the case for a tribute-list set in 737 by the equally annalistic Iran stele.

9) Dating Menahem's death to 743 is supported by 2 Kgs 15,19-20's onerously expensive but transitory intervention by Tiglath-Pileser III in his favor: this presumably already desperate and so very plausibly quickly fatal fiasco is best dated to 743, since the Eponym Chronicle sequence: "In Arpad." (743, following Astour; Millard), "Against Arpad." (742-740) indicates that northern Syria was militarily paralyzed in this year.

10) The preceding dates avoid a triple overlap among Judaeen kings and allow construction of a precisely-defined later 8<sup>th</sup> century biblical chronology consistent with all reasonable data (Fig. 1).

2706 Harrison St.  
Oakland, CA 94612  
USA

Jeremy GOLDBERG

## SUMMARY

The massive Assyrian invasion of Judah in 701 (reflected in 2 Kgs 18,13b; 18,17-19,37) has apparently been confused with an earlier, limited invasion in Hezekiah's 14<sup>th</sup> year (reflected in 2 Kgs 18,13a.14-16; 2 Kgs 20; 2 Chr 32; Isa 22). Historically, this earlier campaign can best be dated to 712, when Sargon II apparently led the Assyrian royal guard on a Palestinian campaign. Chronologically, this dating fits perfectly with e.g. recent dating of the definitive fall of Samaria (2 Kgs 18,9: in Hezekiah's 6<sup>th</sup> year) to 720. 2 Kgs 18,9's parallel dating to Hoshea's 9<sup>th</sup> year agrees with his apparent accession in 731 *or* 729. Dating Menahem's death to 743 (as required, following biblical data, to avoid a triple overlap among Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz) agrees with Eponym Chronicle evidence for this dating of 2 Kgs 15,19-20's presumably already desperate fiasco, and is consistent with a plausibly composite 738 tribute-list naming Menahem. Combining these datings produces a workable later 8<sup>th</sup> century biblical chronology.



Fig. 1 - Structure of proposed chronology

ISRAELITE REGNAL YEAR		JUDAEAN REGNAL YEAR		SEASON	EVENT(S)
754/spring 753	y.41 Jeroboam II / y.0 Zechariah	fall 755/754	y.38 Uzziah	spr/sum 754	death Jeroboam II / acc Zechariah
754/spring 753	y.0 Zechariah / y.0 Shallum	fall 754/753	y.39 Uzziah	fall 754/ win 753	reign Shallum / start interregnum
753/spring 752	y.0 Menahem	fall 754/753	y.39 Uzziah	spr/sum 753	end interregnum / acc Menahem
750/spring 749	y.0 Pekah				acc Pekah as counter-king
748/spring 747	y.2 Pekah	fall 749/748	y.1 Jotham	spr/sum 748	acc Jotham as coregent
743/spring 742	y.10 Menahem / y.0 Pekahiah	fall 743/742	y.50 Uzziah	fall 743/ win 742	death Menahem / acc Pekahiah
741/spring 740	y.2 Pekahiah	fall 741/740	y.52 Uzziah / y.1 Ahaz	fall 741/ win 740	death Pekahiah / 'acc' Pekah
		fall 741/740	y.52 Uzziah / y.1 Ahaz		death Uzziah / acc Ahaz as coregent
733/spring 732	y.17 Pekah	fall 734/733	y.16 Jotham	spr/sum 733	deposition of Jotham / 'acc' Ahaz
730/spring 729	y.20 Pekah	fall 730/729	y.20 Jotham / y.12 Ahaz	fall 730/ win 729	death Pekah / start interregnum
729/spring 728	y.0 Hoshea	fall 730/729	y.20 Jotham / y.12 Ahaz	spr/sum 729	end interregnum / acc Hoshea
726/spring 725	y.3 Hoshea	fall 726/725	y.16 Ahaz / y.1 Hezekiah	fall 726/ win 725	acc Hezekiah as coregent / death Ahaz
722/spring 721	y.7 Hoshea	fall 723/722	y.4 Hezekiah	spr/sum 722	start 'siege' of Samaria
720/spring 719	y.9 Hoshea	fall 721/720	y.6 Hezekiah	spr/sum 720	fall of Samaria
		fall 713/712	y.14 Hezekiah	spr/sum 712	Assyrian invasion
		fall 698/697	y.29 Hezekiah / y.0 Manasseh	fall 698/ win 697	death Hezekiah / acc Manasseh
		fall 643/642	y.55 Manasseh / y.0 Amon		death Manasseh / acc Amon
		fall 641/640	y.2 Amon / y.0 Josiah		death Amon / acc Josiah
		fall 610/609	y.31 Josiah	spr/sum 609	death Josiah etc.

Note: y.0 = uncounted accession year;

'acc' = biblically recorded start of a coregent or counter-king's sole rule.

**Fig. 2 - Reigns in Julian years and chronographic conventions for later 8<sup>th</sup> c. kings of Israel and Judah**

Zechariah	754 – 754	Uzziah	793/2 – 741/0	Rounding up of regnal year totals
Shallum	754/3 – 754/3	Jotham	748 – 733	Postdating for non-coregents
Interregnum	754/3 – 753	Ahaz	741/0 – 726/5	Antedating for coregents
Menahem	753 – 743/2	Hezekiah	726/5 – 698	Fall royal new year in Judah
Pekahiah	743/2 – 741/0			Spring royal new year in Israel
Pekah	750/49 – 730/29			
Interregnum	730/29 – 729			
Hoshea	729 – 720			

# ANIMADVERSIONES

## Nursling, Advisor, Architect? אָמון and the Role of Wisdom in Proverbs 8,22-31

This article will study Proverbs 8,22-31 and the perennial *crux interpretum* אָמון in verse 30. It will attempt to choose the primary meaning of the word from among the various possibilities afforded by the evidence and supported by various scholars, and will demonstrate conclusively that the principal connotation of אָמון in this passage is nursling, fledgling, novice, ward, or the like. It will also examine the possibility that the author alludes simultaneously to several roles in his portrait of Lady Wisdom.

The interpretation of אָמון in verse 30 has long been subject of debate, which continues unabated even among the most recent modern scholars<sup>(1)</sup>. Three basic explanations are currently under consideration. These meanings correspond to those of the root אָמון in other biblical passages, Aramaic, and Phoenician inscriptions on the one hand and a like sounding Akkadian word on the other. Each is possible on linguistic grounds and able to draw on support from comparative evidence<sup>(2)</sup>.

1. The word has been read *ʾāmûn* (cf. Lam 4,5) and associated with אָמון or אָמונה meaning nurse or child tender, so Wisdom is seen as God's young nursling, ward, and the like. Several scholars have pointed to Ma'at, the Egyptian goddess of justice and cosmic order (?), as a parallel to the child-like character of Wisdom in this chapter. This interpretation, with a variation, has been defended by Michael Fox<sup>(3)</sup>. Following the medieval grammarian Ibn Janah and exegete Moshe Kimhi, Fox parses the word not as a substantive but as an infinitive absolute meaning "being raised" or

(1) The various interpretations go back to apocryphal, early Christian and Rabbinic literature and the ancient Bible translations. For a survey of ancient and modern views see commentaries and dictionaries and especially the scholarly articles listed in the following notes. Cf. also R.N. WHYBRAY, *Wisdom in Proverbs* (Studies in Biblical Theology 45; London 1965) 95-104; G. VON RAD, *Wisdom in Israel* (London 1972) 145-157; L.G. PERDUE, "Cosmology and the Social Order in the Wisdom Tradition", *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, (eds. J.G. GAMMIE – L.G. PERDUE) (Winona Lake 1990) 457-478, esp. 463-468.

(2) Other interpretations take the root to mean "faithful" or "steady" and translate "confidant" (so *NJPS*) and the like. There have been as well several suggestions of emendations in the vocalizations. R.B.Y. SCOTT, "Wisdom in Creation: the *ʾāmôn* of Proverbs viii.30", *VT* 10 (1960) 213-214, suggests reading *ʾōmen men* meaning, supposedly "binding" or "uniting" and translating "then I was at his side like a living link", but this not only makes little sense but is based on an extremely rare word (Isa 25,1). The same may be said about P.A.H. DE BOER, "The Counsellor", *VTS* 3 (1955) 42-71, esp. 69-70, who suggests reading *ʾimmôn*, an invention of his, which he goes on to interpret as a diminutive "little mother" which means actually Queen Mother.

(3) M. Fox, "Amon Again", *JBL* 115 (1996) 699-702.

“growing up”. This solves the grammatical difficulty and obviates the slight emendation to the vocalization.

2. The noun חָמָן (*ḥmān*) means artisan (cf. Cant 7,2) or architect, so Wisdom has been taken to proclaim that she is a chief craftsman who assisted God in creating the world. Avi Hurvitz has supported this interpretation on morphological grounds, preserving the Massoretic vocalization, and claiming that the noun form *qāṭōl* is one that indicates professions<sup>(4)</sup>. Cleon Rogers III advocates this meaning for the word but suggests that for reasons of syntax the referent is not Wisdom but God<sup>(5)</sup>.

3. The word has been associated with Akkadian *ummānu* and Aramaic cognates meaning advisor and designating important court officials. This interpretation has been discussed at length by Henri Cazelles, who has adduced much comparative evidence about royal court advisors in Mesopotamian literature and in Ahiqar<sup>(6)</sup>. This is the only interpretation that has not been challenged because of morphological difficulties.

When confronting a polyvalent word the ultimate task is to determine which single meaning best suits the context in which it appears. All other options, interesting as they may be, are beside the point. This implies that in order for an ambiguous lexeme to be interpreted definitively the entire passage must be read as to its overall meaning, temporarily leaving the questionable word unexplained. Only then may the reader choose an explanation of the problematic term that is most appropriate. So let us first examine the larger literary unit to clarify the context.

Prov 8,22-31 is the concluding passage of a long paean of self-praise by Lady Wisdom, occupying all of chap. 8. However, whereas in the previous verses Wisdom boasts of the many benefits she holds out to mankind, and the ruling class in particular (vv. 15-16), in this concluding passage she claims as much as to be a boon even to YHWH Himself. Also, the chronological framework changes. In vv. 1-21 Lady Wisdom speaks in the present, telling how she benefits mankind now, while in vv. 22-31 she reverts to the hoary past.

There are two basic elements in this passage. On the one hand, Wisdom refers to YHWH's acts before, during, and after the creation of the world, thereby accounting for the origin and maintenance of cosmic order. Quantitatively this is the dominant component of the pericope. However, all this material appears in adverbial uses, and secondary, subordinate clauses marking it as background. The backbone and main part of the speech, expressed in a chain of finite verbs in past tense, is a description

(<sup>4</sup>) A. HURVITZ, “Toward a Precise Definition of the Term חָמָן in Proverbs 8:30” (in Hebrew), *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters. Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (ed. S. JAPHET) (Jerusalem 1994) 647-650.

(<sup>5</sup>) C.L. ROGERS III, “The Meaning and Significance of the Hebrew Word חָמָן in Proverbs 8,30”, *ZAW* 109 (1997) 208-220. A similar position had been proposed previously by M. DAHOOD, “Proverbs 8:22-31”, *CBQ* 30 (1968) 513, 518-519.

(<sup>6</sup>) H. CAZELLES, “Ahiqar, *Ummān* and *Amun*, and Biblical Wisdom Texts”, *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots. Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Z. ZEVIT – S. GITIN – M. SOKOLOFF) (Winona Lake 1995) 45-57. See also J. GREENFIELD, “The Seven Pillars of Wisdom (Prov. 9:1) – a Mistranslation”, *JQR* 76 (1985) 13-20.

of things done to Wisdom or Wisdom's own actions corresponding with the different stages of YHWH's activity. Wisdom stands center stage describing her own life against a backdrop of YHWH's creative works. These two elements may be examined separately, first the background and then the main narrative.

The stage is set in a primordial age. These times are referred to in vv. 22-23 with four adverbial phrases and adverbs denoting the distant past, essentially the beginning of time: ראשית דרכו "at the beginning of His way" (i.e. "the first of His deeds"; cf. Job 40,19 אל ראשית דרכי "the first of El's ways", describing Behemoth); קדם מפעליו מאז, "before His works of then"; מעולם, "from eternity"; and מקדמי ארץ, "from before/ the beginnings of the earth".

Vv. 24-25 continue to describe the time before creation, but no longer in general, temporal terms. Now Wisdom declares her precedence to the main forces of nature and components of the universe. First she speaks in the negative, referring to the non-existence of certain major components of the universe: באין תהמות, "when there were no subterranean waters"; באין מעינות נכבדי מים "when there were no springs heavy with water" (7). Describing the unformed universe negatively, in terms of what did not yet exist, is comparable to the beginning of the J creation account in Gen 2,4 and the Babylonian creation myth *Enuma elish*. Continuing her speech, Wisdom simply speaks of preceding certain events but no longer in negative formulation: בטרם הרים הוטבעו "before the mountains were submerged (in the water)"; לפני גבעות "before the hills (were founded)". Finally, in v. 26 both negative and positive references to past events occur, in a single verse as a conclusion of this pre-creation period in time: עד לא עשה ארץ ודוּצוּת "while He had not yet made the land and unsettled areas"; וראש עפרות הבל "before/at the beginning of the dust of the dry land" (8). Afterwards, in vv. 27-29, adverbial phrases containing infinitive constructs with possessive pronominal suffixes anteceded by God mention actual acts of creation indicating the progression of time: ברחינו שמים "when He established/founded/ made firm the heavens"; בחקו חוג על פני המים "when he inscribed a circle (the horizon) on the face of the water". These indicate the first steps in creating the heaven and the earth, while באמצע שחקים ממעל "when He strengthened the highest heavens above" and בעוז עינות תהום "when He strengthened the wells of the deep" (or "when the wells of the deep gushed forth") indicate the completion of the process.

After completing the heavens and the earth, the sea and foundations of the earth must be maintained in their place, for the sea perpetually threatens to wash away the land, while the earth itself is unstable, prone to trembling and earthquake. At any moment the world could revert to chaos. Cosmic order is preserved by continued divine fiat, expressed by repeating the word דוּק found in v. 27 but with different meanings and grammatical forms: בשומו לים חוקו ומים לא יעברו פיו // בחוקו מוסדי ארץ "when

(7) Emendation to מים נכבי, "sources of water" as in Job 38,16 and on the basis of Ugaritic *mbk* is inconsequential for our discussion.

(8) For the word pair דוּק//דוּק see Job 5,10.18,17. הבל appears in Job 18,17 indicating perhaps a traditional triplet דוּק//דוּק//הבל.

He imposed His ordinance (חוק is a substantive) upon the sea so that the water does not transgress His word, when He ordained (חוק is an infinitive construct with possessive suffix) the foundations/ regulations of the earth"<sup>(9)</sup>.

V. 31 refers to the dry land (חבל) which results from God's successful management of the sea, and finally to humanity, בני אדם, indicating that creation has been completed.

This exquisitely structured account of creating, structuring, and maintaining the world, serves as a chronological setting and cosmological backdrop for the main narrative, the autobiography of Lady Wisdom. There is a problem in interpreting this autobiography, for some of the terms used are slightly ambiguous. This is directly related to the problem of אמן, so when reading and preparing to define that term we must be aware of the possibilities of different interpretations.

Wisdom was created by God. The word קני can be translated "acquired me", which could imply that Wisdom is God's maidservant or wife. It could also indicate that Wisdom was already in existence and that she is either eternal like God or had come into existence independently of Him at some undesignated date in the past. Both these possibilities are highly unlikely on theological grounds and would contradict what follows. Since חוללה in the continuation means "I was born", in this context קני more likely means "created me". It has the specific connotation of "bore me" as in Gen 4,1 describing the birth of Cain, the first human being born of a woman (see also Deut 32,6; Ps 139,13). The conception or gestation of Wisdom is described with the verb נסכתי "I was poured out". This indicates either insemination (Niph'al of נסך; cf. נזך in Job 10,10 חלב הניכתי) or development in the womb (Niph'al of סכך; see Ps 139,13 "have you not poured me out like milk and solidified me like cheese?"), or development in the womb (Niph'al of סכך; see Ps 139,13 "כי אחזה קניה כליחי חסכני בבטן אמי"; "It was you who created my conscience [kidneys]; you fashioned me in my mother's womb")<sup>(10)</sup>. Some scholars would derive the verb from the noun נסיך, "prince", and translate "I was princely from the start" or "I became princess at the start", but there is no other evidence for such a denominative use of the word for prince. The birth process is described by חוללה (vv. 24,25). The root חיל, which designates trembling and writhing, can refer specifically to labor pangs. In most cases the verb חיל points to the painful process of delivery, but the verb also designates the birthing process in its entirety (Isa 51,2), and appears parallel to ילד (Deut 32,18; Isa 66,8). These prenatal and natal

(<sup>9</sup>) Cf. Job 38,8-11. The verb יסד usually means "lay foundations of a building" but it can also mean "establish" in the legal or administrative sense of "establish a regulation" (e.g. Hab 1,12 [?]; Ps 104,8; Esth 1,8; 1Chr 9,22), and this may be its primary or secondary connotation here. מוסדי ארץ would then mean "the laws of nature", applying a mundane term to the cosmic realm. Cf. also Akkadian *išdu* in expressions such as *išid mātīm kunnu* "to establish the foundation of the land" meaning to organize the land in a political or an administrative sense. Cf. *AHw* 393 s.v. *išdu* 2c; *CAD* I/J 237b s.v. *išdu* 2b. Note also the Rabbinic use of יסד to mean institutions, confirmation and reestablishment of customs; cf. M. JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York 1950) I 582a.

(<sup>10</sup>) Note that in this verse קניה and סכך appear together as they do in Prov 8,22-23.

In light of these birth-related verbs it is possible that דרכו, "His way", has an unnoticed secondary connotation, referring to sexual intercourse as in Prov 30,19, "the way of a man (דרך גבר) in a woman", and 31,3, "give not to women your vigor, or your paths (ודרכך) to ... of kings". ראשית דרכו, "the first of His Way", would then be comparable with the expression ראשית אורו, "the first of his sexual vigor" in which case Wisdom would be God's eldest child and heir (cf. Deut 21,17; Ps 78,51; 105,36)<sup>(12)</sup>. If the text is not viewed purely metaphorically, this interpretation would entail the corollary assumption that there was a goddess, whereas without it we must assume God to be hermaphrodite and self-impregnating. Neither of these alternatives is incompatible with current scholarly fashion<sup>(13)</sup>.

Lastly, in a final stage, corresponding with the existence of the world, she says ואהיה אצלו אמון, "I was אמון alongside him." We will return to this passage later. With a repetition of the verb ואהיה Wisdom goes on to describe herself יום יום משחקת לפניו בכל עת, "I was His pleasure/delight/entertainment daily, playing before Him constantly", entertaining God with her playfulness. At long last she goes out into the world where she plays and entertains humanity, God's final creature משחקת בחבל ארצו ושעשעי את בני אדם "playing in the dry land of His earth, pleasing/delighting/entertaining humanity"<sup>(4)</sup>. The word שעשעים, used twice, is associated in various places with children, describing their own pleasure when at play (Isa 11,8) as well as the delight they give their parents (Jer 31,20). This is the case as well of משחקת, "playing" (Zech 8,5; Gen 21,9 with the by-form מצחק) which appears with שעשעים in ab/ba chiasmic order.

<sup>(12)</sup> Note Hos 12,9 **און** "I have become wealthy, I have acquired **און**" where **און** means wealth and is synonymous with **חיל**, the word parallel to **דרכך** in Prov 31,3. Both **און** and **חיל** can mean either strength or wealth. This could also imply that **און** in Prov 8,22 has a secondary meaning of "acquire".

(14) A. HURVITZ, "שעשועי חכמה in Ps 119 – the Origins of the Phrase and its Linguistic Background" (in Hebrew), *Studies on Hebrew and Other Semitic Languages Presented to Professor Chaim Rabin on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN – S. MORAG – S. KOGUT (Jerusalem 1990) 105-109 sees Prov 8 as the inspiration for Ps 119's unique use of שעשועים to designate intellectual entertainment and delight.

This analysis shows that Wisdom grew up in three stages, corresponding with three ages in the history of the world. She was conceived and born before creation, present at the time of creation, and went out into the world when creation was complete with the appearance of human beings. In fact, the story of Wisdom is her narration of her own life and her maturation process. It is in this context that we must find the primary meaning of אִמּוֹן. Since every other statement of hers relates to her gestation, birth, early childhood, and growing up, it seems that אִמּוֹן too should designate some stage or aspect of this process. It is a life-cycle term. Consistency of context thus weighs heavily in favor of the interpretation “nursling” and the like. If we are to understand אִמּוֹן as architect or advisor we would remove Wisdom’s self-description from its focus on her own maturation to the concern of the surrounding text describing God’s creative activities. It would be the only place where she claims to have been an active participant in creation and not merely a(n interested) bystander.

H. Cazelles and C. Rogers III deny the perseverance of the child image of Wisdom, claiming that words such as שַׁחֲשָׁע and שָׁחַק at the end of her speech need no longer refer to childlike behavior because in most of their uses in the Hebrew Bible they are associated with adults. This permits them to deny the contextual basis for taking אִמּוֹן as a life cycle term to be translated “nursling”. However, this argument is a “red herring”, patently fallacious and misleading. It intentionally introduces into consideration irrelevant factors. Just because שַׁחֲשָׁע and שָׁחַק can relate to both adults and children in other contexts doesn’t imply that it can’t relate to children in this particular connection. There is no doubt, and no one denies it, that these words do have meanings related to childhood, and there is no reason to ignore them here where they are expected and natural, and to insist on only the non-childhood meanings.

Nonetheless, it is possible that the first appearance of שַׁחֲשָׁע and שָׁחַק (v. 30) refers to Wisdom’s childlike behavior in God’s presence, while the second time (v. 31), when she is not home but out in the world among people, שַׁחֲשָׁע and שָׁחַק designate more mature types of entertaining behavior befitting of a young woman. Avi Hurvitz has discussed the use of שַׁחֲשָׁע as a designation in Ps 119 of intellectual delight and has suggested that it is based on Prov 8,31. It may be that already in Prov 8,31 it has this meaning. But this would still be a continuation and completion of the process of growing up and would not disrupt the theme of life cycle.

The contextual argument should be sufficient demonstration that the only proper understanding of אִמּוֹן is “nursling”. But, there are several verses containing the roots שַׁחֲשָׁע or אִמּוֹן which have gone unnoticed in scholarly discussion of אִמּוֹן, and which, when taken together, provide a stylistic or rhetorical argument clinching the case for this interpretation, rendering any other highly improbable if not outright impossible. Let us examine these verses. Isa 66,7-14 contains an idyllic prediction of Israel and Zion’s future redemption. This description is characterized by a long series of terms reflecting the process of birth and early childhood, much as we find in Wisdom’s autobiographical narration. We read there:



Before she labored (חָחַל) she was delivered;  
 before her pangs came she bore a son.  
 Can a land pass through travail (הִיוָּחַל) in a single day?  
 Or is a nation born all at once?  
 Yet Zion travailed (חָלָה) and at once bore her children!  
 Shall I who bring on labor not bring about birth?...  
 Shall I who cause birth shut the womb?  
 That you may suck from her breast consolation to the full,  
 That you may draw from her teat glory to your delight...  
 You shall be carried (עַל צֵד תִּשָּׂאוּ) on shoulders  
 and dandled (תִּשְׂעֶשְׂעוּ) upon knees.  
 As a mother comforts her son...

Crucial for understanding אָמון is Isa 66,12 על צד תִּשָּׂאוּ ועל בְּרָכִים תִּשְׂעֶשְׂעוּ where "dandled upon the knees" is juxtaposed to "carried on the shoulder". This later activity is identical to being carried in the bosom. This is precisely what a child does in the arms of his or her nurse, אָמון, as we find in:

Num 11,12:

"carry him [שָׂאוּ] in your bosom like the nurse [אָמון] carries the suckling";

Isa 49,22b-23a:

"they will bring your sons in the bosom and your daughters will be carried [תִּשָּׂאוּ] on the shoulder"; and kings will be your nurses [אָמוֹנִי] and their princesses your wet-nurses";

2 Sam 4,4: "his nurse carried him" (וְהַשָּׂאוּ אָמוֹנוֹ).

Moreover, in Isa 60,4 we find:

"Your sons will be brought from afar,  
 your daughters nursed [עַל צֵד תִּאֻמְנָה] on shoulders".

The expressions על צד תִּשָּׂאוּ and על צד תִּאֻמְנָה are synonymous and interchangeable. These verses form a "long distance" or "transitive association (a//b; b//c; a//c)" between אָמון and שְׂעִשְׂעָה, precisely the combination we find in Prov 8,30, where we find the two terms juxtaposed in the same verse, וְאִדְּהָ אֶצְלוֹ אָמוֹן // וְאִדְּהָ שְׂעִשְׂעִים. We are no longer dealing with an isolated word with several possible meanings but with a conceptual pair where the second term restricts the semantic possibilities of the first<sup>(15)</sup>. It is not inconceivable that שְׂעִשְׂעָה/אָמון is actually a rare word pair, appearing once in parallelism and once in corresponding parts of identical, synonymous phrases. This bonded association eliminates all possibility of interpreting אָמון as advisor, artisan, or anything outside the realm of child raising. Discovery of this pair permits us to say conclusively that אָמון in Prov 8,30 means "nursling".

<sup>(15)</sup> M. ZER-KAVOD "Da'at Miqra" (in Hebrew), *Sefer Mishley* (eds. M. ZER-KAVOD – Y. KEEL) (Jerusalem 1983) 50 n. 75, after surveying traditional Jewish exegesis on the verse says that "שְׂעִשְׂעִים and אָמון" is a unit which has been separated and is parallel to the expression יֶלֶד שְׂעִשְׂעִים (Jer 31,19)". He does not cite, however, the conclusive evidence adduced here.

Wisdom relates that she received her education or early training in the house of the creator of the universe who was her father and nurse, and one may imply thereby that she learned all she could about the cosmic order by watching her parent at work. As God's daughter she has inherited His wisdom. She has observed creation (שם אני) and has been raised by the creator Himself (ואדירה אצלו אמן) so she knows everything there is to know about the world. It is her גרסא דניקחא, learning acquired with her mother's milk while nursing. She has learned from experience and through teaching of parent and pedagogue, which are the ways of education recommended in the Book of Proverbs. She is now clever enough to entertain the creator Himself, and is certainly sufficiently smart to give pleasure to human beings.

The question arises now, are any of the other connotations of אמן such as advisor or artisan legitimate secondary meanings of significance in Wisdom's speech, intentionally conveyed by the author? A multiple meaning of the word would not be surprising given the genre (wisdom literature) and the statement in Prov 1,6 that the proverbs in the book are intended, among other things, to teach one how to understand riddles (חידות). Scholars are becoming increasingly aware of wordplay in biblical and ancient near-eastern literature, and it would be surprising if none were found in the Book of Proverbs. The essence of some riddles is wordplay or double-entendre, and Wisdom may be intentionally describing herself in ways subject to several legitimate understandings. This question too must be answered by examination of the context. To answer it positively we must find other words in the pericope that would bolster the secondary meanings.

Can אמן also mean "advisor? There is some evidence supporting this possibility. First of all, in v. 4 Wisdom calls to בני אדם, "human beings", who are mentioned at the very end of her speech as enjoying her delights. This connection unifies the chapter and invites us to take into account the wider context when interpreting Wisdom's autobiography. In the larger pericope, consisting of chapter 8 in its entirety, and in particular vv. 14-16, Wisdom proclaims her usefulness to kings and other rulers. This is a function of advisors. Moreover, since the terms חק, "ordinance", עבר פה, "transgress a command", חקק, "ordain", and מוסדי ארץ with the meaning of "rules of nature" (v. 29; see above) introduce concepts of dominion into Wisdom's speech, they create an image of a deity exercising sovereignty in the cosmos. Kings and other potentates employ wise advisors in their service, so it would not be dissonant with the context for Wisdom to play such a role. Two other words which come to mind which could support this secondary interpretation are דרכו in v. 22 and נסכתי in v. 23. דרכו, which may mean no more than "His way" or may allude to sexual intercourse or acquired possessions as suggested above, has been associated with Ugaritic *drkt*, meaning nobility or dominion<sup>(16)</sup>. נסכתי, for its part, has been taken as a denominative of נסיך, prince, and translated "I became a princess".

<sup>(16)</sup> Cf. W.F. ALBRIGHT, "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom", VTS 3 (1955) 1-15, esp. 7-8.

This interpretation is difficult for it would be the only case of נִסִּיךְ forming a denominative verb. Even so, it can be an *ad hoc* invention, compared with שָׂרִים in v. 16, which appears along with the denominative verb יִשְׂרוּ. It is not without interest that one of the traditional epithets of Ea, Mesopotamian god of wisdom of all sorts is *niššiku*, prince, probably synonym of his more common title NUN = *rubû*, and the etymological and semantic cognate of Hebrew נִסִּיךְ<sup>(17)</sup>. This point becomes even more interesting because the next verse mentions the subterranean waters that are Ea's domain. Could the image of the Mesopotamian god be alluded to in this pericope? If these interpretations have any legitimacy, even as secondary meanings, then אִמּוֹן would be in a (secondary) context of words concerning royalty and kingship and there would be some justification for interpreting it as "advisor", related to the Akkadian *ummānu* and Aramaic cognates. There is thus some contextual justification for understanding אִמּוֹן as a royal advisor. It must be remembered, nonetheless that this is at most a secondary meaning, and is tenuous, depending as it does on the validity of interpreting דָּרְכֵי and נִסְכֵּי as mentioned above. In any case, these words at most enable by way of word play understanding אִמּוֹן as advisor.

Another possible secondary interpretation is architect or artisan, but this can draw upon even less supporting evidence. As pointed out above, the background of Wisdom's birth and maturation is the creation of the world. This divine activity is described in other biblical passages as an act of construction, and, indeed, the cosmos is at times described in the Hebrew Bible as a building (cf. Prov 3,19-20; Isa 48,14; Am 9,6; Ps 24,2; 104,3; and especially Job 38,4-11). According to chap. 9, both חִכְמוֹת and perhaps her foolish foil אִשָּׁה כְּסִילֹת built houses, so Wisdom may be called legitimately a builder or an architect. However, the only word in Wisdom's speech relating to the realm of construction and architecture is מוֹסְדֵי, "foundations", in v. 29, and this word may mean "regulations" and refers to cosmic order rather than physical foundations. It is thus possible that by using the word אִמּוֹן Wisdom is alluding to her role as God's chief architect of creation, but again this is based only on a very broad context of images of creation and is not inherent in the speech itself.

In summary, of the three explanations of אִמּוֹן popular in current scholarly literature, the only one fully suited to the context is "nursling". This meaning is required by consistency of Wisdom's self-portrayal in vv. 22-31 and assured by existence of a specific connection between אִמּוֹן and שְׂעִשְׂעִים demonstrated by examination of other biblical passages. The other major explanations are dubious, inconsistent with the main thrust of the speech, imposed on the chapter from the outside, and not inherent to it. The words supporting such interpretations do not come together into a cohesive, coherent image as do the words relating to life-cycle. If not rejected out of hand, they are at most secondary and have the nature of word plays. In fact, depiction of Wisdom as a child nursling practically precludes her role as an architect or advisor, unless she was a precocious

(17) Cf. W.G. LAMBERT – A.R. MILLARD, *Atra-ḫašīs. The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford 1969) 148-149 n. 16; CAD N II 282-283 s.v. *niššiku*.

prodigy. Wisdom may have eventually pursued a career as an architect or a court advisor, but her earliest training described in Prov 8,22-31 came as God's nursling in his newly constructed universe.

Department of Bible  
and Ancient Near Eastern Studies  
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev,  
P.O.B. 653, Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel

Victor Avigdor HUROWITZ

#### SUMMARY

Scholars explain אָמֹן in Prov 8,30 as nursling, advisor, or architect. Analysis of Prov 8,22-31 shows that Wisdom's autobiography contains exclusively "life cycle" terms relating to gestation, birth, and maturation. Accordingly, the only contextually valid meaning of אָמֹן is "nursling". Difficulties perceived in this interpretation are contrived and of no substance. The interpretation defended here is proven decisively by the previously unnoticed existence of "transitive association" indicating a bonded conceptual pairing between אָמֹן and שֶׁשֶׁשִׁים. Although "nursling" is the only valid primary meaning of אָמֹן in this context, it is slightly possible that other interpretations are legitimate secondary meanings, on the level of intentional wordplays and double entendres.

## **Jesus' First Trial: Messiah and Son of God (Luke 22,66-71)**

Scholars are divided about the possible source(s) of Luke 22, 66-71<sup>(1)</sup>; perhaps the best judgment in this matter of sources is that of J. Fitzmyer: "Ascription of vv. 66-71 to 'L' [material proper to Luke] seems to be a better solution than a mere redaction of the Marcan parallel, though one cannot be apodictic about it"<sup>(2)</sup>. But, whatever one identifies as Luke's source(s) for this episode, if one follows the Modified Two-Source Hypothesis, one cannot but assume that Luke made a number of decisions about what he found in Mark regarding the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. In particular, Luke had to know that and how Mark presented the Sanhedrin's concern about Jesus' being Messiah, Son of God and he must have determinedly chosen not to duplicate the Sanhedrin's phrasing in Mark; "Messiah, Son of God". Luke's separation of the two titles for Jesus is a deliberate choice, not the unintentional result from use of a source other than Mark; it was a choice taken for a specific reason, and it is to suggest and to discuss this reason that this essay is written.

### **Parallel Structures**

If one looks at the structure of Luke 22, 66-71, one is first struck by the absence of certain factors that are found in other renditions of this trial, e.g., false witnesses and the charge that Jesus opposes the Temple (Mark 14,56-58) (and the claim of blasphemy [v. 64]). Luke has reduced the matter, from that point of view, to a focused concern only about the two titles, Messiah, then Son of God. The Sanhedrin's purpose in pressing Jesus about these titles and nothing else comes clear in Luke's episode just after the trial: the core charge there against Jesus before Pilate is that Jesus says he is Messiah, a king (23,2). The centrality of this accusation in the second trial helps make clearer why Luke concentrated on this title in the first trial.

(<sup>1</sup>) Cf. D. BOCK, *Luke II* (BECNT; Grand Rapids 1996) 1776; I.H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids 1978) 847-848: "...the evidence suggests that his [Luke's] account of the trial is based on a separate tradition which is more primitive than that in Mk"; G. SCHNEIDER, *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesu nach Lukás 22,54-71* (München 1969) 105.

(<sup>2</sup>) J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (AB 28a; New York 1985) 1458.

But not only does Luke reduce his focus solely to the Messiah-Son of God question. Luke, knowing Mark's story, intentionally separates the question about Messiah from that about Son of God<sup>(3)</sup>. Now, with one's attention on the structure Luke has chosen for this trial story, and aware that Luke has chosen to present only the Christological question, one recalls an earlier structuring along the same lines as we find here, in the Annunciation story which opened the Gospel description of Jesus. There as here, Luke has presented a three-stage procedure by which to stress the Messiah-Son of God aspects of the identity of Jesus. The comparison is noteworthy.

1. In the Annunciation story, there is first presented a description of Jesus as Messiah of Israel (Luke 1,32-33). This description parallels the Sanhedrin's opening gambit, "If you are the Messiah, tell us".
2. Then, in the Annunciation story, Mary offers a statement which will provoke a second response from the angel (Luke 1,34). So in this trial, Jesus will prophesy about the future and so will lead the Sanhedrin to a second intervention in the form of a question.
3. Finally, there is, both in the Annunciation (Luke 1,35) and in this trial scene, the key reference to the title "Son of God", placed intentionally at a distance from the title "Messiah".

(As a minor comparison, one may note how in each scene there is structurally the same type of alternation of voices: 1. the lead; 2. the reaction; 3. the lead again.)

That these three steps structure both the Annunciation and the trial scene before the Sanhedrin is clear and surely intentional. Is the purpose behind these two examples of the parallel structures the same? Consider the point of the double identification of Jesus in the Annunciation scene. It serves to condition the title "Messiah": to give the title a sense it never had in Tradition before, while at the same time assuring a definition to Jesus that exceeds the usual meaning of Messiah. The double identification by the angel also serves as an ongoing abiding interpretation of the adult Jesus, the Messiah of Israel, again with the understanding that Messiah and Son of God are quite different in what each says about Jesus. Considered from the point of view of literary device, this double

(3) FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1492: "These questions...echo the double angelic announcement in the infancy narrative...What was foreshadowed in the infancy narrative...reaches with crescendo its climax in this scene". This essay looks to explain this affirmation through use of a consciously repeated structure and to draw out some of the implication of Son of God at this climactic point.

identification serves as an introduction, with all that "introduction" means, as the rules of narratology would indicate.

In a similar, though not identical way, the repetition of the Annunciation structure in the trial structure suggests the following. First, since we are at the beginning of the legal process which will bring Jesus to death, this structure is meant to prepare the reader for the fuller appreciation of the identity of the one to be condemned. Second, the identifications of this person as Messiah and Son of Man should be clearly maintained; they are not synonyms, and are not to be exchanged one for the other without clear understanding of their irreducible differences. Third, while Luke suggests that the titles are not synonymous by his very separating them (contrary to Mark's style), the three-step procedure of the trial, in that it is a conscious imitation and repetition of the Annunciation structure, indicates that the reason the titles are not synonymous is to be found in the introduction to the entire Gospel identification of Jesus: the Annunciation. Because of the repetition of the structure regarding Messiah-Son of God, we are forced to look back to the first example of the structure in order to bring forward the teaching of its story to the story in which we find the structure repeated.

#### The Beginning is the Trial

I have assumed that the two examples of parallel structure described above are both "beginnings". It is easy to see that the Annunciation can be called a "beginning", for it is the first scene to define the person Jesus. Can the trial before the Sanhedrin be rightly called a "beginning"? There are a number of points in the Gospel at which one learns that Jesus is to die. Perhaps the clearest beginning point is Luke's rephrasing of Mark: "They were filled with rage (= foolishness) and began to discuss among themselves what they might do to Jesus" (Luke 6,11). Other moments which alert the reader to Jesus' death are certainly Jesus' own prophecies (Luke 9,22.44; 18,32-33) and his ominous words to open his Last Supper, "I have greatly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer" (Luke 22,15). And one usually includes in the story of Jesus' suffering such stories as Jesus' agony in the Garden and the denials of Peter. But, if one really wishes to point up the formal, legal beginning of Jesus' journey to death, one must go to his trials, and specifically to the first, that before the Sanhedrin. From this point of view, the trial before the Sanhedrin is a true beginning, and can be looked upon as analogous to the Annunciation scene, which

itself is the beginning of the attempt to identify Jesus. And, in accord with that first attempt, the scene before the Sanhedrin is, as Jesus' life is decided upon, the right place to reaffirm the identity of the one about to be condemned to death. In this, Luke is drawing from the earlier Annunciation scene the meaning he wishes his reader to give to the one judged and condemned by the highest authorities of Palestine. The formal beginning, the trial, is the proper place to repeat the three-step procedure which reminds the reader of the revelation that Jesus is Messiah and Son of God, as related in the Annunciation scene.

### Messiah and Son of God

By his first verse (1,1) and by the question he has the Sanhedrin put to Jesus (14,61), Mark may give the impression that Messiah and Son of God (Mark's "Son of the Blessed One" in the trial of Jesus) are interchangeable titles. While Luke intends to remove this impression, in the Annunciation scene and again in this trial scene, the matter demands a distinction<sup>(4)</sup>. The distinction is between what the Sanhedrin meant when it asked, "So you are the Son of God?" and what Luke means when Jesus carefully answers, "I am".

### The Sanhedrin and the Son of God

What did Luke's Sanhedrin understand when it asked Jesus if he was the Son of God<sup>(5)</sup>? From the telling of the story, it is clear that it is Jesus' saying about the future sitting of the Son of Man at

(4) BOCK, *Luke*, 1798: "'Son of God' in this context is ambiguous and, without the additional remarks of Jesus, could have been taken to mean 'Messiah'"; but the additional remarks of Jesus do not spell out for the Sanhedrin any figure other than the Messiah — it is impossible to claim that Jesus is defining, by his future exalted status, a relationship with God that, on the one hand, explains his unique relationship during his public life with his Father and, on the other hand, says anywhere near as much as does Luke 1,35.

(5) While I am not in total agreement with all that M. Gourgues says about what the Sanhedrin understands in this Lucan dialogue, his opinion is very worthwhile, M. GOURGUES, *A la droite de Dieu* (Paris 1978) 147: "'Fils de Dieu' connotent alors l'idée d'adoption, d'intimité et de protection particulière de la part de Dieu. Dans notre passage, le titre doit être compris à cette lumière. Il y a peut-être un sens équivalent à 'Messie', y ajoutant cette idée que celui-ci est objet de faveur et de protection de la part de Dieu. Il faut noter cependant que, dans le judaïsme antérieur à l'époque chrétienne, aucun texte ne témoigne d'une application nette du titre 'Fils de Dieu' au 'Messie'. Aussi bien est-il préférable d'y reconnaître le sens de 'roi'".



the right hand of the Power of God that gives the hint as to what the Sanhedrin understands the meaning of "Jesus, the Son of God" to be<sup>(6)</sup>. But why would reference to "the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power" lead the Sanhedrin to think about Jesus as Son of God? To understand the Sanhedrin in Luke 22,70, the statement of Jesus about the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power must be studied, even if briefly.

These words of Jesus are noted in modern copies of Luke as a citation from the Old Testament. Specifically drawn from the Old Testament is Psalm 110,1, and only these few words from the first verse: (The Lord said to my lord,) "Sit at my right hand...". What Jesus said is not only a rephrasing of the psalm's direct address, but also an interpretation that the one to whom the Lord is speaking is the Son of Man. Since a number of Son of Man statements are recognized by most scholars as attributable to Jesus himself, it is reasonable to think that it was Jesus who knew this composite<sup>(7)</sup> interpretation of the Psalm, namely that it would be the Son of Man who was seated at the right hand of the Power<sup>(8)</sup>. My contention would be that the Sanhedrin, intent on the title Messiah, would ignore the specifics of a Son of Man reference — ultimately because it was not interested in Jesus' exegesis of the "my lord" of the Psalm<sup>(9)</sup> —

(6) The saying of Jesus is generally regarded as being due to redaction, because as MARSHALL, *Gospel*, 850, notes, from the point of view of historicity, "...the question of the Son of man [especially as Jesus puts it in Luke] did not play any part in the Lucan tradition of this trial"; on the other hand, MARSHALL, *Gospel*, 849, notes that "...it is highly probable that the question of Messiahship came up at the Jewish investigation".

(7) Significant is Stephen's exclamation that he saw "the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God" (Acts 7,56). This formulation reflects the identity of Jesus as one other than the Messiah; that the two figures are brought together there is need, in the minds of some (including Jesus), to link compositely the standing "at the right hand of God" with the sitting of Psalm 110 "at the right hand of God".

(8) Son of Man and The Power signal a Palestinian context for Jesus' statement; also, The Power appears to be a reverential avoidance of the classical Hebrew title for God (cf. Psalm 54,3; Jer 16,21; Exod 9,16); Cf. G. DALMAN, *The Words of Jesus* (Edinburgh 1902) 200. This last point gives rise to the suggestion that "for the benefit of gentile readers Lk adds τοῦ θεοῦ", M. ZERWICK — M. GROSVENOR, *An Analysis of the Greek New Testament I* (Rome 1974) 275; cf. MARSHALL, *Gospel*, 850.

(9) Cf. C. EVANS, "The Twelve Thrones of Israel", *Luke and Scripture* (eds. C. EVANS — J.A. SANDERS) (Minneapolis 1993) 156: "The 'son of man' of Dan 7:13-14 was apparently understood in a messianic sense prior to Christianity";

to concentrate on the crucial words it knows to be from the Psalm, namely that “my lord (David’s lord)” was “to be seated at the right hand of the Lord”. The Sanhedrin, upon hearing this reference from Jesus, would sense that Jesus was claiming to be the “David’s lord” called to sit at the Lord’s right hand. Aware that Jesus is making an elliptical claim to be this “lord of David, to be seated at the Lord’s right hand”, the Sanhedrin knows that Jesus is thereby claiming to be Messiah of Israel. How they know of a connection between Messiah and David’s lord is most immediately and simply explained by Luke’s Gospel. The dispute read in Luke 20,41-44, mirroring Mark 12,35-37, reveals that the common teaching of the time (“they say”, v. 41) had identified the “lord” who was to sit at the Lord’s right hand as the Messiah of Israel. Thus, the Sanhedrin thinks it hears, in Jesus’ referring Psalm 110 to himself, a claim that Jesus is Messiah.

But where in the Sanhedrin’s understanding of Psalm 110 and Jesus’ claim to be its “lord” arises the term “Son of God”? The usual answer<sup>(10)</sup> would likely be to note that the Messiah (David’s lord, according to the Psalm) was understood to be God’s son elsewhere in Tradition: such did God call David’s royal descendant at 2 Samuel 7,14; (in part Psalm 89,27). But one can add that Psalm 110 itself suggests that “David’s lord” is son of God. At verse 3 it is said (admittedly an unclear text in the standard Hebrew version, and made clearer through the Septuagint translation)<sup>(11)</sup>: “Yours is

---

190, n. 75: “There is evidence that this psalm [110] was understood messianically prior to Christian usage (probably beginning with the Hasmonean rulers)”. That these two pieces of data could be put together to eventually create the thought that the Psalm was to be understood to promise a Messiah who would be the Son of Man and who would be commanded to sit at God’s right hand — this seems both to be reasonable and to be an exegesis reached not only by others but also by Jesus. That Luke would not be the creator of this exchange of Son of Man and Messiah (*contra*, e.g., H. TÖDT, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung* [Gütersloh 1959] 96), but the inheritor of a tradition rooted in Jesus’ own understanding of the Tradition, makes it easier to see why, in the same chapter (24), Luke would speak once of the Son of Man and then twice of the Messiah — always in the same context of suffering and glorification.

<sup>(10)</sup> Another possible answer draws on the use of ὁ ἐκλεκτός, at the cross, subsequent to this trial (23,35) and placed on the lips of the “leaders”. The similar description, ὁ ἐκλεγμένος, appears as with υἱός μου at Luke 9,35. Thus, there seems to be a certain affinity between Son of God (in the Messianic sense) and Messiah through “the Chosen One”, and this affinity could account for the interchange of Messiah for son of God at Luke 22,66-71.

<sup>(11)</sup> My literal translation of Psalm 109,3 from A. RAHLFS, *Septuaginta II* (Stuttgart 1935) 124: “With you is dominion in the day of your power in the

princely power in the day of your birth, in holy splendor; before the daystar, like the dew, I have begotten you". This particular verse, a part of a Psalm which speaks of a favored "son" of God, was easily linked to another Psalm (2,7): "The Lord said to me, 'You are my son; this day I have begotten you'"<sup>(12)</sup>. This matrix of Old Testament references<sup>(13)</sup> is sufficient here to suggest that, in response to Jesus' hint at Psalm 110, the Sanhedrin thinks he is implying that he is the Messiah, son of God<sup>(14)</sup>. Hence, one can more readily understand that, for the Sanhedrin, Son of God is a synonym for Messiah.

### The Messiah: the Concern of the Sanhedrin

I have already earlier referred to the fact that the way Luke presents the matter, the Sanhedrin is intent on presenting Jesus to Pilate as claiming to be Messiah King. This intention explains in part why the concern of the Sanhedrin is only on that title when it stands Jesus before itself. Whatever else Jesus may say about himself, then, is immaterial to the Sanhedrin<sup>(15)</sup>. Actually, in this vein, one notes that this "trial" is no true trial at all<sup>(16)</sup>. The story seems to say that

---

splendor of the holy people; from the womb, before bearer of light, I have begotten you".

<sup>(12)</sup> In line with what we know of Rabbinic rules of exegesis of the time (in our case: *gezerah shevah*), one would legitimately interpret Psalm 2,7 with the help of Psalm 110,3 by the shared phrasing: ἐξεγέννηκά σε (Psalm 110,3) and γεγέννηκά σε (Psalm 2,7).

<sup>(13)</sup> Luke's is not the only writing which suggests a reading of Psalm 110 to clarify the significance of Jesus. The Letter to the Hebrews represents a tradition which has woven together the descriptions of the One seated at God's right hand, the Son of God, and the High Priest — all appellatives to be found in the verses of Psalm 110.

<sup>(14)</sup> E. LOHSE, "υἱός", *TDNT* VIII, 360: "[Israel] employed 'son of God' only when quoting the Messianic promises and elsewhere avoided this term for Messiah".

<sup>(15)</sup> FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1467: "Jesus' declaration asserts the exaltation of himself as the Son of Man and of his investiture with power". While Jesus' session at the right hand of the Lord can be imagined as an "investiture with power", one must, given the Lucan framework, distinguish this moment from the moment of the investiture of that power experienced in the public life of Jesus since the time of his baptism. Indeed, essentially that power during his lifetime included forgiveness of sins, raising the dead to life, expulsion of demons; how is one to distinguish this power from that with which Jesus is invested at his session at God's right hand?

<sup>(16)</sup> Contrary, J. NEYREY, *The Passion According to Luke* (New York 1985) 71: "[Luke 22,66-71] serves Luke's purpose to describe a solemn, valid and

the present goal of the Sanhedrin is not an unbiased or impartial determination as to whether or not Jesus is Messiah or has made that claim at an earlier time; rather the goal seems to be to get Jesus to admit now that he is Messiah. Nothing else matters; "the high priests and scribes were seeking how they could bring Jesus to death" (Luke 22,2) – apparently they had decided that the key to bringing him to death was his condemning himself "out of his own mouth". In any event, they themselves were not ignorant of the Messianic/Kingly claim about Jesus; they had heard the shouting: "Blessed is the one coming, the king, in the name of the Lord" (Luke 19,38)<sup>(17)</sup>.

The Messiah, The King — the Sanhedrin is looking for Jesus' word by which he condemns himself according to this title. The first demand, that Jesus say if he is Messiah, fails to achieve its goal. But<sup>(18)</sup>, when Jesus describes himself as David's lord seated at the right hand of the Power, the Sanhedrin realizes that it has heard the claim to Messiahship<sup>(19)</sup>. To repeat and to finish, the Sanhedrin uses the term Son of God as a synonym for Messiah; it understands no more exalted meaning in this title, and so does not accuse Jesus of blasphemy.

### Luke and the Son of God

But, if the Sanhedrin understands Son of God to be synonymous with Messiah, what does Luke understand by the title<sup>(20)</sup>?

---

formal trial of Jesus by Israel"; yet he will admit that there is "no capital sentence" (75).

<sup>(17)</sup> Apparently it is Luke who has adjusted the Marcan report about the continuous shout about Jesus' being "the blessed one who is to come": Luke prefers the shout to be: "Blessed is the one coming, the King, in the name of the Lord" (Luke 19,38 drawing upon Psalm 118,26; such texts as Zech 9,9 and Zeph 3,15-17 seem to have had their influence in this matter of the "King", too).

<sup>(18)</sup> Cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1467: "The conj. *oun* does not merely repeat the former question, but draws a conclusion from Jesus' answer to the first question".

<sup>(19)</sup> J. NOLLAND, *Luke* (WBC 35b; Dallas 1993) 1112: "Son of God" is an exalted status and relationship to God experienced by the messiah, but for the interrogators there is only a heightened repetition of their probe about messiahship in v. 67".

<sup>(20)</sup> Cf. MARSHALL, *Gospel*, 851: "It is unlikely that divine Sonship is regarded simply as a metaphorical attribute of the Messiah"; FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1463, is still clearer: "The title *huios tou Theou* is not to be understood as a mere equivalent of *christos*; more is implied"; cf. also H. TÖDT, *Menschensohn*, 96-97: "Dabei erhalten die verwendeten Würdenamen *der Christus*, *Menschensohn*, *Sohn Gottes* so verschiedene Bedeutungsnuancen, dass von einer sachlichen Identität nicht zu sprechen ist".

First, as argued earlier, the very structure of this trial hopes to make the reader remember the structure of the Annunciation, where one moves from the revelation about the Messiah to the revelation about the Son of God; by virtue of this structure the reader is asked to bring this sense of "Son of God"<sup>(21)</sup> forward to this beginning point of the death of Jesus<sup>(22)</sup>. By this literary structural device Luke means to have the reader recall the fundamental revelation about Jesus, that he, Messiah (1,32-33), is at the same time significantly other than Messiah by dramatically presenting Son of God as a separate issue in the Annunciation of God.

Thus, the structure invites one to think of Son of God in its individuality, as this is described in the Annunciation. And what the Annunciation offers as content for this structure is the revelation that Jesus is Son of God, not by adoption, but after the manner of procreation<sup>(23)</sup>. Sonship is only adoptive where the Tradition about Messiah is concerned; thus, the meaning of "son of the Most High" (1,32) when the Angel means to identify Jesus as Messiah according to the Tradition. With Luke's dramatic presentation of a second revelation, that of Son of God, Jesus is described as a person beyond all the meanings and expectations of Messiah which the Tradition

(21) SCHNEIDER, *Verleugnung*, 184-185, prefers to interpret Son of God in terms of Jesus' obedience to his Father, "Jesu Verbundenheit mit dem Vater, 'Christus Gottes', ...der [Titel] den Gesalbten auf seinen heilsgeschichtlichen Weg leitet und begleitet". Certainly, a facet of Sonship is obedience to the Father, as the answers of Jesus to temptation show; but, for Luke in the final analysis, it is the holiness of Jesus that accounts for his obedience, the holiness (like Jesus' Sonship) which is spoken of in the angel's revelation to Mary at Luke 1,35. "In Stage I [which represents the time of Jesus] of the gospel tradition the question [v.67] would have been asked in the political sense. But in Stage III [the time of Luke's writing] Luke obviously intends the question to carry a deeper christological nuance as well", FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 1466-1467.

(22) One might make the same observation when confronted with an earlier combination of these same titles at Luke 4,41, a text wherein one recognizes once again a Lucan redaction of Marcan material: it is Luke who again brings these two titles into a proximity which can only make one aware again that he has carefully distinguished them in the Annunciation scene. A glance at Luke's Acts of the Apostles reveals the same phenomenon: Paul proclaimed that Jesus was Son of God (9,20) and 'proved' that Jesus was the Messiah; the differentiation of verbs here is crucial to begin to point up that for Luke Messiah and Son of God are quite different in meaning. (Cf. the apposite remarks of J. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles* [New York 1998] 435).

(23) Cf. J.J. KILGALLAN, "The Conception of Jesus (Luke 1,35)", *Bib* 78 (1997) 225-246.

over centuries had developed. The Messiah, when in the Third Gospel called Son of God, is for Luke engendered in the womb of a woman by a mysterious action of God's Holy Spirit and power<sup>(24)</sup>. The non-sexual, creative intervention of God accounts for what is born of the woman, and leaves one with the logical conclusion that Jesus, her son and David's progeny, is Son of God. Generated non-sexually by God, Jesus has no other cause of his physical being than the God who acts upon the womb of the woman so that a child be produced<sup>(25)</sup>.

Because of this intervention, the woman can describe herself as virgin. Because of this intervention one can explain the peculiar, mysterious, unique relationship occasionally glimpsed in the adult life of Jesus, a relationship expressed by Jesus in Father-Son terminology. Such a remarkable relationship it was that would lead him to say that only he, and those to whom he revealed his knowledge, knew the Father (Luke 10,22). This relationship, Luke insists through his Annunciation story, makes clear that the Father-Son terminology of Jesus' adult life cannot refer to adoptive kinship: Messiah in the Tradition would mean that, but, for Luke, it no longer means that.

Thus, when one reads a description of the opening "trial" of Jesus in Luke, one can be and should be very clear, with the help

(24) MARSHALL, *Gospel*, 851, would rather find another key to explaining the Sonship of Jesus: "For Luke, sitting on the right hand of God is tantamount to divine Sonship"; cf. TÖDT, *Menschensohn*, 96: "Diese unmittelbare Folgerung [Messiah, Son of Man at the right hand of God] setzt voraus, daß die sessio ad dexteram dei ein Charakteristikum der Gottessohnstellung ist". I would prefer to think that, for Luke, the session of Jesus at God's right hand is an indicator of Sonship, but that the explanation can only be found in the Annunciation scene. The resurrection-ascension of Jesus, according to Peter's Pentecost speech, produced justification for the titles Messiah and Lord; there was no mention there of Son of God. Later, in Paul's speech at Antioch, Psalm 2,7 is used, by which a connection is drawn between being "my son" and "begetting today". This "begetting today" refers to the resurrection, but, given the sequence of statements in the Psalm, sonship seems to be the reason for the "begetting" or resurrection, rather than vice-versa.

(25) Cf. LOHSE, "υἱός", *TDNT* VIII, 360: "...sonship was not construed as physical descent in these OT sayings, but rather as expressing the ruler's validation by God"; but E. SCHWEIZER, "υἱός", *TDNT* VIII, 382 does apparently not see any distinction between this OT view and Luke's view: "Since Luke was not interested in the biological question...". Certain elements of biology are not in the Annunciation story, but that the birth caused by God is biological is the Lucan claim.

of the literary signals Luke gives, what Luke understands is the meaning of the question, "You are then the Son of God?" Leaving aside what the Sanhedrin meant by its question, the author wants his reader to remember that it is the Son of God, the one not adopted but engendered by God, who is experiencing now the decision that will bring him to crucifixion. It is the Son of God in this Lucan sense<sup>(26)</sup> who falls prey to the plan of the priests and scribes, to have Jesus put away.

### Son of God as Part of an Introduction

Is it realistic to say that a word spoken in Chapter 1,35 influences the meaning of what we read as far along as Luke 22,70? Sometimes it is noted that what is said about Jesus at Luke 1,35 is never stated again, in the Gospel of Luke or in Acts. The statement is true: there is no explicit reference in Luke's works, nor a recalling by any character in his story, of what was announced at Luke 1,35. Should one make a distinction and say that explicit reference is lacking, but that leaves open the possibility of implicit reference? But still one would say: there is no place where, even implicitly, the text suggests

<sup>(26)</sup> D. CATCHPOLE, *The Trial of Jesus* (Leiden 1971) 197: "[H. TÖDT, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Traditions* (London 1965) 101-103] argues that Luke has a different conception of the christological titles mentioned in Mk 14.61f. But this is not so, for Luke's own view emerges from the redactional activity at Lk 4.41, as well as from Acts 9.20-22, and it is exactly that of Mk 14.61f. In Luke 4.41, Luke is redacting Mk 1.34...This shows irrefutably the equivalence of the titles in Luke's own mind". That Luke rewrites Mark 1,34 with the combination of titles, Son of God and Messiah, does not mean that Luke thinks the titles are equivalent. Rather, one can say, as I am arguing analogously in this essay about the use of the titles in Luke 22, that the demons, like the Sanhedrin, used the titles interchangeably. The demons here see that the powers of Jesus, the powers of the Messiah, are also the powers of the Son of God; but that demonic perception, based on such mighty powers, in no way means to exclude or even include what Luke and his reader know about Jesus from Luke 1,35. (That the demons speak of "the" [*ho*] Son of God is curious and interesting.) One might also note the view of NOLAN, *Luke*, 1109, given many years after that of Catchpole, "Luke is not known for creating parallelisms, so the parallelism here [Luke 22,66-71] is likely to be from a source". This would mean, *pace* Catchpole, that Luke is not strictly speaking "redacting" Mark, but turning to another source (cf. NOLAN, *Luke*, 1109). This in turn means that Luke, at 4,41, implies that he wants a source with a double reference to Jesus and not Mark's phrasing. And why does he want to change Mark? Simply to convey twice, through different titles, the identical meaning for Jesus?

a generation of Jesus as Luke 1,35 describes<sup>(27)</sup>. Indeed, faithful to the reports about Jesus' public life wherein no reference is made to his conception, Luke does not tinker with the stories of the public life, but overcomes any misunderstanding about Jesus the adult and his relationship with God by giving his reader the Annunciation story. But, still the persistent question: how is it that one, gifted with this story, is to carry its meaning forward throughout all of Gospel and Acts?

The answer to this question is that the Annunciation story is part of the introduction to Luke's Gospel, and that the introduction has as one of its chief characteristics to alert the reader to the right way to interpret what will be said in the body of the narrative. Exegetes give witness to this literary principle when, for instance, they remark that the descriptive title "light for revelation to the nations" (Luke 2,32) will be applicable to Jesus, to varying degrees, as Luke-Acts develops. One obvious reason that they are right to say this is that this descriptive title, though never used again of Jesus in the Lucan works, is part of that introduction which, even if never repeated again in its details, is to be read into all that Luke wrote<sup>(28)</sup>. Who does not see that "light for revelation to the nations" is a proleptic guide to the identity of Jesus? Who then cannot see that Son of God, in the sense explained in Luke 1,35, is as well a proleptic guide to the identity of Jesus meant to influence the entire reading about Jesus?

Assumed here is that the beginning chapters of Luke are introductory to the entire work; specifically, the introduction runs

(27) One might take exception to this statement by citing the story of Jesus' being found in the Temple, specifically by citing Jesus' question, "Must I not be in the work of my Father (in my Father's house)?" (2,49). Certainly, this question does not repeat verbatim what is in Luke 1,35, but its assertion of Sonship is based totally and only on that text; moreover, the activity of Jesus in the Temple is the point of proleptic affirmation of at least a major part of what it will mean to be Son of God (1,35) in Jesus' public life: teacher to Israel from God.

(28) Cf. J.-N. ALETTI, *Il Racconto come Teologia* (Roma 1996) 20: "In tutti questi racconti [included in this group is Luke 1,26-38, p.17] gli interventi divini fanno parte del tessuto narrativo e la loro importanza non dev'essere minimizzata, perché hanno una funzione *programmatica*...". J.-N. Aletti is usually here referring to divine interventions which result in action, but it is clear from the Annunciation scene that the ruler of the house of Jacob is not only announced, but identified and defined: the Messiah from the house of David, known to be the adopted son of God, is in reality, to be known by the reader as mysteriously the result of the Power and Spirit of God within the womb of a woman.



from Luke 1,5 (after the prologue of 1,1-4) to 4,13. This essay is not concerned to treat this matter of introduction exhaustively, but a rehearsal of the basic reality is worthwhile, when we speak of Luke's introduction.

The limit of the introduction is set at the point where Jesus begins his public life; in Luke, that beginning point is at 4,14. The reason for identifying the beginning of the public life as the end of the introduction is rooted in the perception that the material which explains the death of Jesus is only the public life of Jesus, never the material which anticipates his public appearance in Galilee. With the public life, the Jesus who has admittedly appeared already for temptation and baptism — this Jesus becomes finally the dynamic personage of the drama unfolding in public to his death. What then preceded that public life is meant literarily to be a help to the reader who, while on the one hand proceeding with others (like Peter, Pharisees, Herod, the sick, the sinner) through Jesus' life in search of his identity, on the other hand knows infinitely much more about Jesus, thanks to the introduction, than anyone who met him ever knew about him during his public life.

The limit of Luke's introduction is also determined, for those who follow the Two-Source Hypothesis, by the extreme likelihood that Luke fashions his introduction according to the structure of the introduction in Mark's Gospel. The introduction of this latter work extends over the first thirteen verses of Chapter 1, and is divisible into four parts or testimonies about Jesus: 1. Mark's witness that Jesus is Messiah, Son of God; 2. John's witness that Jesus will baptize with the Spirit of God; 3. God's witness that Jesus is His beloved Son; 4. the desert's witness that Jesus is the Messiah. This fourfold witness is the structure behind Luke's introduction. His hand is obvious in the development of these four points, and in the addition of Jesus' genealogy. But it is clear that Luke limits himself by the four-point introduction used by his source Mark. Thus, as in Mark, so in Luke, the introduction ends with the appearance of the adult Jesus in Galilee, when the major player steps onto the public stage as catalyst who begins the work for which he is destined. Luke has an introduction, then, and his introduction has the characteristics of an introduction, a major characteristic being that it represents the author's intent to present here what he expects the reader will carry with him throughout the work — in this instance, that Jesus is Son of God in the sense of that title Luke reveals in 1,35.

\* \* \*

In his effort to focus the reader's attention on the identity of the one who is condemned by two authorities in Palestine and thus sent to death, Luke reminds his reader that Jesus is Son of God in a mysterious and unique way, that Messiah of the Tradition must be understood through the reality about Jesus' sonship from God. He means to establish this reminder successfully by separating the two titles, Messiah and Son of God, which he saw joined together in Mark's presentation of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. The structure he followed in his own presentation of the trial of Jesus is that of the Annunciation, a three-step procedure by which he hoped to alert the reader that the revelation given in the Annunciation story should be recalled in this trial story. One can imagine that Luke, by presenting Jesus as Messiah and Son of God in Luke's sense, hoped to accomplish a number of things. One thing he hoped to accomplish is that the status of him who now suffers the final condemnation is clear: mysteriously related to the Father, it is the Son who, born holy, dies in obedience to the Father. Once again, the reader catches a glimpse of a relationship which remains, for all of Luke's efforts, finally mysterious; Luke 1,35, however, is a precious guide to approaching this mystery correctly and it is by its guidance that one understands, in a way the Sanhedrin did not, what it means to call Jesus, the Messiah, Son of God.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico  
via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

John J. KILGALLEN

#### SUMMARY

Luke, according to the Two-Source Theory, read Mark. At the first trial of Jesus, that before the Sanhedrin, Mark has together: "Messiah, Son of God". Luke has intentionally separated the two titles. The present essay finds the explanation for separating Son of God from Messiah in the Annunciation scene of the Gospel. It is Luke's intention that the reader understand Son of God in a way that admittedly the Sanhedrin did not. The laws of narratology indicate that Luke 1,35, a part of the Lucan introduction, be used by the reader to interpret Son of God at Luke 22,70.

## The Motif of the Sleeping Divinity

### I

The motif of the sleeping divinity, as Batto has already noted<sup>(1)</sup>, is present in the Old Testament. He has studied it in his article, especially in the second part, where he speaks about “Biblical Appropriations of the Motif of the Sleeping Deity”. It is also the subject of a note by H. Jacobson<sup>(2)</sup>.

This motif appears in the biblical passages where the root ישן refers to God. The root in its various verbal forms means “to sleep, to rest, to be quiet”<sup>(3)</sup>. In Ps 44,24; 78,65; and 1 Kings 18,27 it is accompanied by the verb קץ which means “to wake up, to rise from sleep, to get up”. In Ps 121,4 the verb ישן appears along with the verb נם, which is a synonym for ישן in the prophetic texts<sup>(4)</sup>. The combination ישן – קץ, to sleep and to wake up, is the basis of the biblical motif (Ps 78,65 and 1 Kings 18,27). In Ps 44,24 these two verbs are complemented by a third verb, עור, “to rise, to get up”. In Ps 78 the three verbs create a sequence: to sleep, to wake up, to get up.

The root ישן appears in different contexts and is part of various formulations. In Ps 44,24 we find it in the question למה תישן, “why do you sleep?”, followed by two imperatives, עור, “get up, wake up”, and הקיצה, “wake up”. These three verbs together comprise an appeal to God to wake up. The sleep of the divinity has been interpreted in different ways. Kraus sees a plea in Ps 44,24, “Stürmische Bitten beschließen das Klagelied des Volkes”<sup>(5)</sup> addressed to God who has hidden his face so that it seems that he has fallen asleep or has forgotten his people<sup>(6)</sup>. The sleep of God could indicate his inattention to this prayer, as Dahood observed<sup>(7)</sup>.

Ps 78, 65 uses the very graphic image of a hero who wakes up from his sleep, וכיץ כשן ארני כנור, to describe the god who intervenes<sup>(8)</sup>. However, in 1 Kings 18,27 the question, ואולי ישן הוא וכיץ, “perhaps he is asleep and must be awakened” is a kind of provocation that Elijah addresses to the priests of Baal. To complete this brief survey of the motif of the sleeping divinity we also note Ps 121,4 where it is said that the guardian of Israel, לא ינמ ולא ישן, “does not doze and does not sleep”.

(1) B.F. BATTO, “The Sleeping God: An Ancient Near Eastern Motif of Divine Sovereignty”, *Bib* 68 (1987) 153-177.

(2) H. JACOBSON, “Elijah’s Sleeping Baal”, *Bib* 79 (1998) 413.

(3) Cf. J. SCHÜPPHAUS, “ישן, jāšen”, *TWAT* III, 1033-1034.

(4) SCHÜPPHAUS, “ישן, jāšen”, 1033.

(5) See H.-J. KRAUS, *Die Psalmen* I, (BKAT XV/1; Neukirchen 1960) 329.

(6) Cf. A. WEISER, *The Psalms* (OTL; Philadelphia 1962) 359: “the members of the cult community have now gradually drawn near even to the God who hides his face so that it looks as if he is asleep or has forgotten his people”.

(7) M. DAHOOD, *Psalms 1-50* (AB 16; Garden City 1965) 268: “The sleep of God, who really does not and cannot sleep (Ps cxxi 4), simply means that by remaining inattentive to the prayers of his people he gives the impression of being asleep”.

(8) Cf. WEISER, *The Psalms*, 542: “a very daring picture” — “a strong man, intoxicated by wine, arises from sleep”.

The most common element in these verses is God who wakes up and rises from sleep: why do you sleep? Wake up, get up! (Ps 44,24); he wakes up (Ps 78,65); perhaps he is sleeping, it is necessary to awaken him (1 Re 18,27).

There are also some other texts in which an appeal to God uses the imperatives עורר (e.g. Ps 7,7) and הקיצה (e.g. Ps 35,22-24; 59,5), "get up, wake up!". But since the verb שן is absent it is not certain that these passages refer to the motif of the sleeping divinity<sup>(9)</sup>.

## II

Some texts from Mesopotamia are very useful, even necessary, for the understanding of the biblical motif of the sleeping divinity<sup>(10)</sup> because they also contain it; but it appears in two explicitly different forms: a) the divinity wants to sleep but cannot; b) the divinity is sleeping and must be awakened.

The first *topos* appears in *Atrahasis* I<sup>(11)</sup> and *Enuma Elish*<sup>(12)</sup>.

In *Atrahasis* I Enlil cannot sleep because of the noise that the human race is making.

[Twel]ve hundred years [had not gone by],  
[The land had grown wide], the peoples had increased,  
The [land] was bellowing [like a bull].  
The god was disturbed with [their uproar],  
[Enlil heard] their clamor.  
[He said to] the great gods,  
"The clamor of mankind [has become burdensome to me],  
"I am losing sleep [to their uproar]"<sup>(13)</sup>.

<sup>(9)</sup> BATTO, "The Sleeping God", 167, 171-172.

<sup>(10)</sup> See G. WIDENGREN, *Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und Judentum* (Stuttgart 1955) 62-79; id., "Early Hebrew myths and their interpretation", *Myth, ritual, and kingship* (ed. S.H. HOOKE) (Oxford 1958) 142-203; esp. 191; BATTO, "The Sleeping God", 153-177; JACOBSON, "Elijah's Sleeping Baal", 413.

<sup>(11)</sup> The most recent translation of *Atrahasis* appears in B.R. FOSTER, *Before the Muses. An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. Vol. I (Bethesda, MD 1993) 158-201. *Atrahasis* includes both the *topos* of the god who wishes to sleep but cannot, as well as that of the god who must be awakened. By *Atrahasis* I we mean the *topos* of the god who wants to sleep but cannot. By *Atrahasis* II we mean the god who sleeps and must be awakened. There is also a very fragmentary text in which the surviving words *Enlil - noise - destroy* indicate a parallel to *Atrahasis* I; cf. the critical edition by W.G. LAMBERT, "A new Fragment from a List of antediluvian Kings and Marduk's chariot", *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae dedicatae Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl* (eds. M.A. BEEK - A.A. KAMPMAN - C. NULAND - J. RYCKMANS) (Leiden 1973) 271-275, 280. For a tentative reconstruction of this text see T. JACOBSEN, "The Eridu Genesis" *JBL* 100 (1981) 513-529, esp. 514 n.4, 519-520 n.10. Unfortunately Jacobsen does not cite Lambert's article.

<sup>(12)</sup> The most recent translation, with bibliography, of *Enuma Elish* appears in B.R. FOSTER, *Before the Muses. An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. Vol. I (Bethesda, MD 1993) 351-402.

<sup>(13)</sup> FOSTER, *Before the Muses*, vol I, 168-169 = tablet I, 352-359. This same text, repeated on 171 = tablet II, 1-8.

In *Enuma Elish* the primordial gods cannot sleep because of the noise made by the younger gods.

"Their behavior is noisome to me!

"By day I have no rest, at night I do not sleep!

"I wish to put an end to their behavior, to do away with it!

"Let silence reign that we may sleep" (14).

The second *topos* — the sleeping god who must be awakened — appears in *Atrahasis* II. Here Enlil's sleep is interrupted because the lesser gods, tired of working to support the greater gods, are about to attack his house.

Nusku woke [his] lord,

He got [him] out of bed,

"My lord, [your] house is surrounded,

"Battle has run right up [to your gate].

"Enlil, your house is surrounded,

"Battle has [ru]n right up to your gate!" (15).

This same *topos* also appears in the Sumerian poem *Enki and Ninmah*, a text which, as far as we know, has not yet been noted in the discussion of the sleeping biblical divinity.

The text is known from fragments of three different copies (16) from the old-Babylonian period. Unlike most of the texts that made up the Sumerian literary corpus of this period, *Enki and Ninmah* continued to be copied after the old-Babylonian period and even exists in a fragmentary bilingual edition from the neo-Assyrian period in which the Sumerian is accompanied by an Akkadian translation. The Sumerian text in the old-Babylonian version differs in places from that in the neo-Assyrian version. The translation that follows uses, as much as possible, the old-Babylonian version.

The first part of the poem states that, after the separation of heaven and earth, the gods had to work for their sustenance. They found this unacceptable. Enki, the clever water god, is asleep "in the deep abyss". As in *Atrahasis* II the lesser gods rebel and refuse to work to support the greater gods (17). Namma, Enki's mother, goes to awaken him. She asks him to create a substitute for the gods, a creature that would work in their place and maintain them (18).

(14) FOSTER, *Before the Muses*, 355 I, 37-40. Batto has already cited these two passages, "The Sleeping God", 159 (*Atrahasis*) and 161 (*Enuma Elish*). We repeat these citations for the convenience of the reader but according to Foster's translation.

(15) FOSTER, *Before the Muses*, 161; I, 78-83.

(16) See R. BORGER, "Einige Texte religiösen Inhalts", *Or* 54 (1985) 18-20.

(17) This parallelism between *Atrahasis* II and *Enki and Ninmah* was already noted by W.G. LAMBERT "The Relationship of Sumerian and Babylonian Myth as seen in Accounts of Creation", *La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le Proche-Orient Ancien. Actes de la XXXVIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, Paris, 8-10 juillet 1991 (eds. D. CHARPIN - F. JOANNÈS) (RAI 38; Recherche sur les Civilisations; Paris 1992) 130.

(18) For a preliminary edition of this very difficult poem see C.A. BENITO, 'Enki and Ninmah' and 'Enki and the World Order' (A Dissertation in Oriental Studies.

*Enki and Ninmah*<sup>(19)</sup>

- <sup>8</sup> After the gods were forced to [work for?] their food...  
 for their dining halls,  
<sup>9</sup> The great gods stood at the work, the lesser gods bore the labor.  
<sup>10</sup> The gods dug the canals, they heaped their dirt in Harali.  
<sup>11</sup> The gods were sweating, they complained about their lives.  
<sup>12</sup> Then the one of broad intelligence, the creator of the great gods;  
<sup>13</sup> Enki in the deep abyss, in the flowing water, a place whose interior  
 no god can look on,  
<sup>14</sup> Lay on his bed, did not rise from sleep.  
<sup>15</sup> The gods wept: "He (Enki) brought about (our) lamentation" they  
 said.  
<sup>16</sup> To the one who was in the swamp, who was lying down, who  
 did not rise from his bed,  
<sup>17</sup> Namma, the primordial mother who gave birth to the great gods,  
 brought the weeping of the gods to her son.  
<sup>18</sup> "Lord, you are certainly lying down; you are certainly sleeping.  
<sup>19</sup> You [yourself do not] rise [from your sleep].  
<sup>20</sup> The gods you created are smashing [their tools].  
<sup>21</sup> My son, rise from your bed; with your knowledge it is you who  
 have sought out skills.  
<sup>22</sup> Make a substitute for the gods: they will let go of their toil".  
<sup>23</sup> Enki at the word of his mother Namma rose from his bed.

These two different *topoi* must not be confused. In the first two texts a god wishes to sleep but cannot because of human (*Atrahasis* I) or divine (*Enuma Elish*) noise. In the other two texts (*Enki and Ninmah* as well as *Atrahasis* II) a god is sleeping and must be awakened.

## III

In the biblical texts we have emphasized the awakening of the divinity. This awakening is either requested (1 Kings 18,27; Ps 44,24) or takes place spontaneously (Ps 78,65). Although the context of these texts is different, the awakening of the divinity is common to them all. In Ps 44 God is called upon to wake up and save his people. The community of believers insistently asks that God intervene, that he wake up and act in its favour (44,24). In Ps 78 God appears as a hero who awakens (78,65) and gets

---

University of Pennsylvania, 1969; facsimile Ann Arbor 1977) 9-76; esp. 34-44. A more recent edition is that of H. SAUREN, "Nammu and Enki", *The tablet and the scroll: Near Eastern studies in honor of William W. Hallo* (ed. M.E. COHEN et al.) (Bethesda, MD 1993) 198-208. For lines 17-24 of the poem see the very important study by W.G. LAMBERT "The Relationship of Sumerian and Babylonian Myth", 129-135, where he analyzes lines 17-37. For recent translations of the poem see T. JACOBSEN, *The Harps that once...Sumerian Poetry in Translation* (New Haven - London 1987) 151-166; S. N. KRAMER - J. MAIER, *Myths of Enki, the Crafty God* (New York - Oxford 1989) 31-37.

<sup>(19)</sup> Our translation follows the text established by Benito for lines 8-16 and by Lambert for lines 17-24.

up on his own. In 1 Kings 18 the motif of the sleeping god appears but its function in this story is very different than in the Psalms. Elijah encourages the priests of Baal to yell with insistence so that their god will wake up.

In two of these texts (Ps 44,24 and 1 Kings 18,27) appeal is made to the sleeping god to wake up and intervene. The third text (Ps 78,65) is different from these two in that God is compared to a hero who spontaneously wakes up.

Study of these various biblical verses permits us to see which Mesopotamian texts have elements in common with the biblical texts in which a sleeping divinity must be awakened because his intervention is necessary.

*Atrahasis* II and *Enki and Ninmah* are the Mesopotamian texts that contain parallels to the biblical passages in which God sleeps, is awakened, and gets up. The appeal to the sleeping god to awaken is the element common to the biblical verses and to *Atrahasis* II and *Enki and Ninmah*. *Atrahasis* I and *Enuma Elish* are not parallel to these biblical passages because in these texts the gods do not sleep. They cannot sleep because of human or divine noise. There is no need to appeal to them to wake up because they are already awake. The problem that we find in the Bible is not divine insomnia as in *Atrahasis* I and *Enuma Elish*; rather, it is the opposite.

In summary, the Mesopotamian parallels to the sleeping god in 1 Kings 18,27 and to Ps 44,25 are *Atrahasis* II and *Enki and Ninmah* rather than *Atrahasis* I and *Enuma Elish* precisely because the point of the biblical comparison is a sleeping god who must be awakened, not a god who wants to sleep but cannot.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

Andrzej MROZEK  
Silvano VOTTO

## SUMMARY

This note discusses biblical and Mesopotamian texts that contain the motif of a sleeping divinity. Their comparison shows that the presence of the same theme, sleep, is not sufficient of itself to make the texts parallel. The other common element, the need to awaken the sleeping divinity, must be present in the texts for parallelism. The note shows that the biblical texts have their Mesopotamian parallel not in the texts where a deity wishes to sleep and cannot, but rather where he is sleeping and must be awakened.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Chong-Leong SEOW, *Ecclesiastes. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 18C). New York: Doubleday, 1997. xiv-419p. 24 x 16,5

Seow's commentary is an important contribution to the continuing discussion of the interpretation of Ecclesiastes, perhaps one of the most relevant as well as most enigmatic books of the Old Testament. Qohelet's frustrations in his search for meaning "under the sun" have been echoed by countless philosophers through the ages, but perhaps never as closely as existentialist and postmodern thinkers at the end of the second millennium CE. This, at least in part, explains the book's relevance. The book's enigma, however, is its own interpretation. Determining the meaning of the book of Ecclesiastes can indeed be as frustrating as "chasing the wind". Seow acknowledges this point in his opening sentence ["There is perhaps no book in the Bible that is the subject of more controversies than Ecclesiastes", ix]. Disagreements over introductory matters as well as interpretation flourish. This point may be demonstrated by comparing many of the recent attempts to describe the heart of Ecclesiastes' message, as illustrated by the varied understandings of the meaning and the place of הבל in the book. Traditionally, הבל has been understood to mean an absence of meaning or meaninglessness (the modern rendition of sixteenth century English 'vanity' [KJV]). Most modern English versions of the Ecclesiastes (NIV, etc.) render the word this way and a defense of this meaning can be found in T. Longman III, *Ecclesiastes* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 61-65. Michael Fox suggests a fine-tuning of the translation of הבל as 'absurd' (*Qohelet and His Contradictions* [BLS 18; Sheffield 1989] as well as forthcoming). More radically, Dan Fredericks (*Coping with Transience: Ecclesiastes on Brevity in Life* [Sheffield 1993]) has argued that the traditional rendering is completely wrongminded. The core idea of vapor or bubble should be understood as a metaphor not of significance but of time. His conclusion is that Qohelet bemoans fleeting time rather than missing meaning. We will note Seow's innovative approach to the question of הבל below.

But even at those rare times when scholars reach agreement on the meaning of the *Leitwort* הבל, disagreements continue over the emphasis that the book places on it. Is הבל, in whatever meaning, the conclusion of the book? Or is it the conclusion only of Qohelet as opposed to the epilogist? Perhaps it is not a final conclusion at all. Whybray ("Qohelet, Preacher of Joy", *JSOT* 23 [1982] 87-98 and *Ecclesiastes* [NCBC; Grand Rapids 1989]), for instance, argues that the book's ultimate conclusion is not הבל, but *carpe diem*. Qohelet is a preacher of joy, not of pessimism or nihilism.



Where does Seow fit into this mix of ideas about Ecclesiastes?

In the first place, we should observe that Seow's commentary is well-rounded, addressing issues of theological message, historical background, and literary style. In the past, the Anchor Bible Commentary has produced some volumes that have emphasized philology to the detriment of comment on the message of the book. The newer volumes have much more balance, and Seow's contribution is no exception here. His introduction includes sections on the title, canonicity, textual criticism, language, socioeconomic context, authorship, and the message. He also provides a lengthy bibliography on past research.

Space does not permit comment on all aspects of Seow's well-written introduction. I will focus on areas where he provides innovative approaches. Perhaps the most notable of these is his view of the Persian period date of the book. Specifically, Seow argues for a date between 450-350 BCE (38). A large part of his argument has to do with the language of the book. He notes the presence of a large number of Aramaisms in the text. He admits that some Aramaic influence on the language is pre-exilic, but argues that the extent of Aramaic influence on Ecclesiastes indicates a post-exilic date. One might pause here and question even this assumption, considering how little we really know about the language and its development. Do we really know enough about regional dialects, vernacular/literary dialectics, or even the possibility of linguistic updating of books through the ages to make arguments based on the language? But Seow presses the issue further and states that certain terms in the book have a meaning that is exclusive to the Persian period, particularly the mid-fifth to mid-fourth centuries. He cites as evidence חסרן, "deficit", חשבון, "account", and נכסין, "assets" which "all occur as economic terms in Egyptian Aramaic texts from the fifth century. These terms are not attested in Aramaic or Hebrew prior to the Persian period" (13). On the other side of his chronological divide, Seow cites the evidence of שלם and its derivatives in the book of Ecclesiastes. He cites D. M. Gropp's "The Origin and Development of the Aramaic שלם Clause", *JNES* 52 (1993) 31-36, as demonstrating that שלם in this sense does not occur after the Persian period. Seow thus feels confident in asserting that the linguistic evidence points to the Persian period. In making this argument, he most directly contests views that would place the book later in the Hellenistic period.

But does the language demonstrate the date this clearly? In the first place, we might debate whether חשבון has the meaning "account" in Qoh 7,25.27; 9,10. Cannot it mean the "sum of things" (*NRSV*) or the "scheme of things" (*NIV*)? Furthermore, even if the word with the meaning "account" is not attested in Hebrew and Aramaic earlier than the Persian period, this is an argument from silence. It is notable that in Ugaritic, the cognate *ḥtbn* is found with the meaning "account" (cf. the *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Vol. 2 [ed. W. VanGemeren] [Grand Rapids 1997] 304; hereafter *NIDOTTE*). Similar questions could be raised about נכסין, which has an Akkadian cognate or perhaps even a Sumerian one (*NIDOTTE*, vol. 3, 107). And חסרן, a hapax noun form in the Hebrew Bible, does not clearly have the narrow economic meaning "deficit," which Seow attributes to it (122-123), and is related to a common Hebrew verb, which makes it a dubious indicator of the date

of the language of the book. So, too, it is not at all clear that שלט has the narrowly defined economic meaning attributed to it by Seow. My point in raising these issues is not to argue for an alternative date, either earlier or later, but simply to question whether the language of the book can prove to be a reliable guide to the date of the book.

To be sure, the linguistic arguments are only a part of his case for a Persian date of the book. He also points to the cultural background ("Socioeconomic Context," cf. 21-36) of the book as pointing to the period 450-350 BCE. He specifically cites the growth of a monetary economy during the Persian period (Qoh 5,10-12[9-11]; 7,12; 10,19). He also notes the arbitrariness of royal gifts during the Persian period, which could have led to insecurity (25), and perhaps stands behind Qohelet's worries about a God who seems to hand out his gifts arbitrarily as well. Furthermore, but related, is the idea that Qohelet reflects a class oppression which Seow believes is especially descriptive of this period of time. He cites Qoh 5,8-9 [7-8] as alluding "both to the economic exploitation and the opportunities in such a society": "If you see the oppression of the poor and the violation of justice and right in the province, do not be surprised over the matter—for an arrogant one is above an arrogant one, (and) arrogant ones have watched over them all" (Seow's translation, 27). Indeed, this passage does describe the kind of class distinctions and imbalance of power that we know from Persian period. However, it also describes pre-exilic society in Israel, Hellenistic society, and perhaps any society. Again, I do not believe Seow has made his point about a precise date for the book, especially when we take into account that the period is still, despite recent advances, not well known to us, even by his own admission (21).

What is Seow's view of the message of the book? He gives his fullest expression of the message of the book on pages 47-60 of the introduction. He begins with an analysis of the word הבל, which runs as a motif through the book. He rightly gives its literal meaning as "breath, whiff, puff, steam", describing "anything that is superficial, ephemeral, insubstantial, incomprehensible, enigmatic, inconsistent, or contradictory" (47). So far so good, but Seow goes on to suggest that each context in the book needs to be examined to see what nuance the word has and then understand its meaning accordingly. He does translate הבל as vanity, throughout, but this is just a cover translation ("for want of a better alternative", 102). In the notes he offers what he thinks is the actual meaning of the word. To be sure, Seow is correct that words can vary in their nuance within a single book. However, I question whether this is the case in a book like Ecclesiastes where it often occurs in a formula, and even when it does not, seems to be like a refrain that reverberates throughout the book. I also think it also is unlikely that the word denotes transience, as Seow argues in some contexts. Qohelet rather hammers away that life, in all its permutations, is "meaninglessness" (Longman, *Ecclesiastes*, and 61-65).

Seow asserts that the book describes a world where God is in control and gives humanity a world that is "unreliable and so full of contradictions" (50). Here I think he has rightly captured the message of Qohelet. He does see the world as contradictory, and it is wrong to try to sort out the contradictions in Qohelet's speech by means of redactions or quotations.

On the other hand, God, according to Seow, has given humanity a gift of joy as well. Here, of course, he is reflecting on the so-called *carpe diem* passages (2,24-26; 3,12-14; 5,18-20 [5,17-19]; 8,15; 9,7-10). And again, he is right to see this joy as divinely given. The question, though, is what is Qohelet's stance toward these passages and towards the God who doles out joy? Seow believes Qohelet has a positive attitude. Death comes to all, so all should enjoy life as they can. I believe, on the other hand, that Qohelet sees the simple joy of food, drink, and work as distractions from the harsh realities of life. They are deceptions, so to speak (cf. 5,9-6,9, particularly 5,20 [19]). Reality, according to Qohelet, is "life is miserable, and then you die". God allows some to enjoy life, thus forgetting about life's hard reality and one's certain end in death. Whereas Seow believes that Qohelet calls for acceptance of the hard conditions of life and its occasional glimpses of joy, I believe that the bottom line for Qohelet is injustice (4,1-3) and frustration (9,11-12), and then death (12,1-7). We must remember, after all, that his speech is bracketed by the *הביל* refrain (1,2; 12,8). Enjoyment is a gift from God, but a dubious one that serves as an "anodyne" (the term is M. Fox's [*Qohelet and His Contradictions*, 73]) to the harsh realities of life.

One of the most pressing issues for the proper interpretation of the message of Ecclesiastes is the relationship between Qohelet's first-person speech and the epilogue, 12,8-14, which refers to Qohelet in the third person. Noting the third person language at the beginning of the book (1,1-11) and the typical first line of an ancient Near Eastern autobiography in 1,12, opens the question of perhaps two voices in the book. The issues surrounding the interpretation of the epilogue cannot be addressed in this review, but suffice it to note that Seow does not believe there is a large disjunction between the sentiment of the epilogue (some of which he does believe is a redactional addition) and the body of Qohelet's speech. He argues that the epilogue does add the important perspective that Qohelet's radical ideas can be held together with more mainstream wisdom thought. However, one must question this conclusion. Certainly, the body of the book, like the epilogue and wisdom, talks about the "fear of God" (3,14; 5,6; 7,18; 8,12), but in contexts where "horror of God" may be a more appropriate translation. He does talk about retribution for evil and for good behavior (8,12-13), but also seems to take away with the same hand that he gives on that idea (reading 8,12-13 in the broader context of 8,10-14). Isolating Qohelet's theology from the narrative frame, I argue that his thought may be summarized as "Life is tough, then you die". The second wisdom teacher (in my interpretation) who addresses his son in the epilogue, on the other hand, seems to open up the possibility of a more positive outlook on life. Qohelet is a foil for radical thinking; he well represents life "under the sun". But there is something more that elicits the obedience and respect called for in the epilogue.

Of the making of many interpretations there is no end. However, in the case of Ecclesiastes that may not be detrimental. While overlap occurs among commentators (cf. Fox, Murphy, Crenshaw [*Ecclesiastes: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia, PA 1987)], Longman, to a certain extent Seow, on the one hand, and Whybray, W. Kaiser (*Ecclesiastes: Total Life*

[Chicago, IL 1979]), and G.S. Ogden (*Qoheleth* [Sheffield 1987]), on the other, the book's ambiguities do not permit dogmatism on many points of interpretation, so the best advice to students is to read widely in the literature and struggle to their own conclusions. Seow is to be thanked for a lucid and thoughtful contribution to the dialogue.

Westmont College  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108, USA

Tremper LONGMAN III

Samuel CHEON, *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon. A Study in the Biblical Interpretation* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha. Supplement Series 23). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1997. 169p. 16 x 24. Cloth: £ 27.50 – \$ 45.00

Peter ENNS, *Exodus Retold. Ancient Exegesis of the Departure from Egypt in Wis 10:15-21 and 19:1-9* (Harvard Semitic Museum Monographs 57). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1997. x-204p. 14,5 x 22. Cloth: \$ 29.95

L'interesse verso la terza parte del libro della Sapienza (Sap 11–19, o, come alcuni preferiscono, Sap 10–19) è cresciuto sempre più negli ultimi trent'anni. La discussione dei commentatori si è spesso focalizzata sul rapporto tra il libro della Sapienza e l'ellenismo, a partire dallo studio del genere letterario della *σύνγκρισις*; allo stesso tempo è cresciuta l'attenzione al carattere *midrashico* che questi capitoli manifestano (cf. ad esempio l'Introduzione nel recente commentario di J. Vélchez Líndez, *Sabiduría* [Estel-la 1990] 39-51).

Proprio di quest'ultimo aspetto si occupano i due recentissimi studi di S. Cheon e di P. Enns. Presento per primo il lavoro di Cheon, di carattere più generale rispetto a quello di Enns: in entrambi i casi si tratta della pubblicazione di una dissertazione dottorale; quella di Cheon (Graduate Theological Union di Berkeley, 1994) diretta da J.C. Endres s.j., con l'aiuto di D. Winston; quella di Enns (Harvard, 1994), sotto la direzione di J.L. Kugel. Una parte di questa dissertazione è già stata pubblicata su *Biblica*: "A Retelling of the Song at the Sea in Wis 10,20-21", *Bib* 76 (1995) 1-24.

Il testo di Cheon si apre con una Introduzione di carattere metodologico (11-23): per ben tre volte (13, 18, 19) l'autore afferma di voler indagare sul modo con il quale lo Ps.-Sal. utilizza il racconto biblico dell'Esodo all'interno di Sap 11,1-4 e 16,1–19,22. Fin dall'inizio del suo lavoro (13) Cheon dichiara inoltre che la sua tesi di fondo è mostrare come il testo delle sette antitesi esodiche è modellato dallo Ps.-Sal. per offrire speranza e consolazione alla comunità dei Giudei di Alessandria al tempo delle persecuzioni di Caligola (38 d.C.). Il libro della Sapienza costituirebbe così un ottimo esempio di quella che, a partire dagli studi di G. Vermes (*Scripture and Tradition in Judaism; Haggadic Studies* [SPB 4; Leiden 1961]), si può definire una 'rewritten Bible'. Cheon critica con forza il

recente lavoro di U. Schwenk-Bressler, *Sapientia Salomonis als ein Beispiel frühjüdischer Textauslegung* (BEATAJ 32; Bern 1993), accusandolo di non discutere la presenza di materiale extrabiblico in Sap 11-19, di non saper offrire una sintesi delle tecniche esegetiche utilizzate dallo Ps.-Sal. e di non discutere, soprattutto, la funzione 'socio-storica' di una tale esegesi; accuse analoghe sono avanzate da Enns (*Exodus Retold*, 11). Cheon descrive poi il suo metodo di lavoro in cinque tappe: isolare l'unità letteraria oggetto di studio, isolare nel testo ciò che corrisponde al materiale biblico utilizzato e confrontarlo, infine, con tale materiale e con il materiale non biblico (limitato però ad Ezechiele il Tragico, Artapano, Filone, Giuseppe Flavio). Le ultime due tappe sono dedicate alla sintesi dei risultati ottenuti e all'analisi del 'socio-historical setting'.

Il capitolo 2 (24-67) si occupa dell'analisi di Sap 11,1-14 e 16,1-29; il capitolo 3 (68-107) di Sap 17,1-19,22. In entrambi i capitoli Cheon si sforza di identificare alcune tendenze esegetiche tipiche dello Ps.-Sal., nelle quali si rispecchierebbero le tradizioni giudaiche più antiche. Notiamo di passaggio come l'analisi dei testi non è molto approfondita; in qualche caso (v. Sap 17,1-18,4) è troppo superficiale, poco attenta ai difficili problemi esegetici che questi testi sollevano. Occupandosi di Sap 19,7-17 Cheon descrive con molta attenzione i rapporti esistenti tra il nostro testo e i testi biblici di Gen 1 e di Es 8 e 14 (v. l'interessante tabella a pagina 99). Appare così evidente come lo Ps.-Sal. rilegga la tradizione esodica alla luce dei testi sulla creazione, come del resto già fa lo stesso testo di Es 14. Ritornerò più avanti su questo punto importante.

Nel capitolo 4 (108-124) Cheon riassume i risultati della sua analisi. L'esegesi dello Ps.-Sal. è basata primariamente sullo studio della Scrittura («a 'searching' of Scripture», 109), non è interessata a chiarire i dettagli del testo, evita i nomi propri (segno di un pubblico molto familiare con i testi biblici), presenta Israele in una luce positiva, combina assieme diversi materiali biblici o li pone in contrasto tra loro, universalizza figure individuali (come Mosè), cerca di scoprire un senso simbolico nei testi biblici utilizzati, usa la tecnica della 'esagerazione', è vicino al genere letterario della 'Wisdom Tale' (qui Cheon utilizza G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* [Cambridge, MA 1972]). Le tendenze teologiche dello Ps.-Sal. sarebbero poi riducibili a tre: "God's Retaliation" (116-119), "The Suffering of the Righteous" (119-122), "Creation and History" (122-124).

Il quinto capitolo (125-149) vuole rispondere al quesito iniziale: perché lo Ps.-Sal. interpreta in questo modo il racconto esodico? Accogliendo la nota ipotesi di Winston (e, aggiungo, di G. Scarpata, di cui viene appena ricordato un vecchio lavoro a pagina 129) Cheon cerca di dimostrare che l'esegesi biblica utilizzata dallo Ps.-Sal. riflette un momento di crisi quale la persecuzione antiggiudaica del 38 d.C. La maggior parte del capitolo è così dedicata alla descrizione del contesto storico all'epoca di Caligola; solo nelle pagine finali (145-149) Cheon si sforza di provare la validità del suo asserto.

Il capitolo finale (150-153) contiene una veloce sintesi dei risultati raggiunti; seguono la bibliografia, l'indice dei passi biblici e extrabiblici e l'indice degli autori moderni.

Il lavoro di P. Enns è per molti aspetti complementare; l'argomento affrontato è più ridotto, ma la trattazione notevolmente più ampia e approfondita. Nella prima parte del suo lavoro Enns si occupa delle tradizioni esegetiche utilizzate dallo Ps.-Sal., da lui considerato tra gli apocrifi (7, n.1); il testo che Enns si propone di studiare è limitato a Sap 10,15-21 e 19,1-9, cioè alla rilettura del tema del passaggio del Mare. Lo scopo che Enns si propone è analogo a quello di Cheon: «why does Ps-Solomon say what he does about Scriptures?» (Enns, *Exodus Retold*, 7). Contrariamente a Cheon, Enns non si occupa del contesto storico del libro, pur accettando, genericamente, la datazione al tempo di Caligola. Seguendo piuttosto la via tracciata dal proprio direttore, J.L. Kugel, Enns affronta lo studio del carattere *midrashico* del libro della Sapienza alla luce dei rapporti con le tradizioni esegetiche giudaiche più antiche, soprattutto con i *midrashim* e la tradizione targumica; il campo di indagine che Enns si propone appare perciò considerevolmente più ampio rispetto a quello di Cheon; osserviamo tuttavia che Enns non approfondisce lo spinoso problema della datazione dei testi (*midrashim* e *targumim*) e utilizza molto poco gli autori giudaici di lingua greca. Dopo aver analizzato a mo' d'esempio alcune tradizioni esegetiche presenti in Sap 10,1-15 (17-34), Enns conclude il primo capitolo (34-41) con l'interessante affermazione che lo Ps.-Sal., piuttosto che impegnarsi in una vera e propria esegesi, «was simply 'talking about the Bible'» (35).

La seconda parte del libro, la più lunga e circostanziata (43-134), si occupa in diciannove punti dei commenti che lo Ps.-Sal. opera alla tradizione esodica del passaggio del mare (Sap 10,15-21; 19,1-9). Non conviene elencare qui tutti i casi discussi da Enns; ne ricordo solo alcuni, aggiungendo qualche osservazione in merito. A proposito di Sap 10,17c (56-66) Enns dedica una lunga analisi alle tradizioni relative alla colonna di fuoco, in particolare al ruolo 'protettore' che tale colonna assume nel testo di Sap. Enns non sembra conoscere il lavoro fondamentale di J. Luzarraga, *Las tradiciones de la nube* (AnBib 54, Roma 1973), né tiene in considerazione il fatto che la colonna di nubi, in Sap 10,17c, e specialmente in Sap 18,3, può diventare da un lato simbolo della sapienza stessa, dall'altro assumere una decisa colorazione escatologica (L. Mazzinghi, *Notte di paura e di luce. Egesesi di Sap 17,1-18,4* [AnBib 134; Roma 1995] 235-239). E' in questa chiave che si comprendono meglio i rapporti con le tradizioni bibliche e giudaiche.

Un buon esempio del modo di procedere di Enns è l'attenzione riservata al testo di Sap 10,19b, dove il Mar Rosso è considerato un 'abisso senza fondo' e in Sap 19,7d una 'pianura verdeggiante'. Enns dimostra nel primo caso (70-73), come lo Ps.-Sal. rilegga il passaggio del mare (Es 15,5,8) alla luce del *tehôm* di Gen 1,2. Riguardo poi a Sap 19,7d (118-123) Enns vi scopre una versione abbreviata della tradizione testimoniata da Tg. Ps.Jon. su Es 15,19 (cf. *Midr. Teh.* 114,38). Inoltre, Enns ritiene che in questo testo lo Ps.-Sal. utilizzi ancora il racconto genesiaco della creazione; egli parla di 'nuova creazione' proprio a proposito di Sap 19,6-7b (112-118).

Riguardo ai contatti con la tradizione targumica, appare geniale la soluzione adottata per spiegare in Sap 10,20c il difficile *ὁμοθυμαδόν*, «with one accord» (75-82). Si tratterebbe in questo caso del più antico tentativo

attestato di risolvere una difficoltà esegetica presente in Es 15,1: perché cioè il TM si apre con un verbo al singolare (יָשַׁר) seguito da un soggetto plurale ('Mosè e i figli di Israele'), poi da un verbo al plurale ('dissero') mentre il 'canto del mare' ritorna di nuovo al singolare ('voglio cantare')? Ritengo tuttavia errata la medesima interpretazione di ὁμοθυμαδὸν proposta per Sap 18,5; qui l'avverbio significa piuttosto 'tutti insieme' (cf. M. Priotto, *La Prima Pasqua in Sap 18,5-25* [Bologna 1987] 38).

La terza parte del libro (135-154) contiene una veloce sintesi dei risultati raggiunti. Un punto importante del lavoro di Enns appare la sottolineatura di come il testo dello Ps.-Sal. nasca dal suo approccio ai testi biblici; non si tratta come si è detto di un vero e proprio 'commento' alle Scritture, ma piuttosto di una 'search for wisdom' (154), prodotto di un 'close reading' (137) della Bibbia; lo Ps.-Sal. è interessato a spiegare i problemi che i testi biblici da lui utilizzati presentano (contrariamente a ciò che pensa Cheon, *Exodus Story*, 110). Ciò conferma, tra l'altro, la grande familiarità con le Scritture dei destinatari del libro, incrinando ancor di più l'ipotesi di coloro che ancora ritengono il libro della Sapienza diretto non soltanto a un pubblico israelita (cf. Vílchez, *Sabiduría*, 70-74). Allo stesso tempo, ritengo importante una seconda conclusione di Enns: lo Ps.-Sal. non è un esegeta solitario, ma è profondamente ancorato a una ricca tradizione giudaica, della quale, in qualche caso, è per noi il più antico testimone.

Chiude il libro, oltre la bibliografia e un indice delle fonti (ma non degli autori moderni né dei soggetti), un'appendice (155-168) contenente il vocabolario utilizzato dallo Ps.-Sal. in relazione a Israele e all'Egitto; si tratta tuttavia di un elenco un po' arido che non viene alla fine discusso.

I due libri di Enns e di Cheon sono vicini nel tema affrontato ed anche, in parte, nelle conclusioni. I problemi sollevati e le soluzioni proposte sono di grande interesse; ritengo che entrambi gli autori offrano un contributo importante alla comprensione del libro della Sapienza. Emergono tuttavia alcuni problemi che meritano di essere discussi.

Un appunto di carattere metodologico è certamente relativo alla scarsa considerazione della bibliografia più recente su Sap, specialmente quella italiana (dovrei ripetere il lamento che *italici non leguntur?* ma anche *hispanici*, cf. il commento di Vílchez). È vero che non si può leggere tutto e che la bontà di una tesi non è direttamente proporzionale al numero di autori citati! Degne di nota, tuttavia, mi sembra la scarsa attenzione ai recenti sviluppi sulla struttura letteraria del libro (v.i. lavori di M. Gilbert e P. Bizzeti, *Il libro della Sapienza*; Cheon lo cita, ma di fatto non lo utilizza); l'aspetto filologico non è molto curato; entrambi gli autori ignorano comunque i due monumentali volumi di Scarpat su Sap 1-6 e Sap 7-12. Assenti infine i riferimenti a studi più ampi sulla terza parte del libro (H. Maneschg, *Die Erzählung von der ehernen Schlange* (Num 21,4-9), [Frankfurt – Bern 1981]; P. Dumoulin su Sap 16,15-17,1 [AnBib 132, Rome 1994]; M. Priotto su Sap 18,5-25) che mettono in luce la stretta connessione tra aspetto giudaico e influsso greco nello Ps.-Sal.

Sempre sul piano del metodo, non appare convincente il modo con cui Cheon affronta il contesto 'socio-storico' di Sap. Il problema del rapporto con Filone è trattato con eccessiva superficialità (cf. 22 n. 47); viene igno-

rato inoltre il problema di un possibile rapporto tra il libro della Sapienza e il Nuovo Testamento. Affermare che il libro della Sapienza non testimonia l'esistenza di scontri interni al giudaismo (145) appare quanto meno azzardato; una sommaria analisi di Sap 2 rivela piuttosto il contrario: protagonisti del capitolo sono infatti i giudei apostati (cf. 2,12), che sono dunque da annoverarsi tra i destinatari del libro. Limitarsi a descrivere l'atmosfera e gli eventi della rivolta anti giudaica del 38 d.C., inoltre, non è sufficiente a giustificare la datazione del libro, che deve essere fatta sulla base di argomenti principalmente filologici (v. al riguardo i molti lavori di G. Scarpato). Personalmente sono incline a ritenere ancora probabile una datazione del libro verso la fine dell'impero di Ottaviano; a questo riguardo andrebbero maggiormente studiati i contatti con i testi del Nuovo Testamento (cf. Mazzinghi, *Notte di paura e di luce*, 276-277).

Anche sul piano del contenuto vi sono alcuni punti su cui discutere. All'interno delle terza parte di Sap sia Enns che Cheon menzionano più volte il 'taglione' (God's Retaliation', Cheon, *Exodus Story*, 116-119; cf. Enns, *Exodus Retold*, 65 n. 55; e 107). M. Gilbert ha dimostrato che non è possibile parlare di 'taglione' a proposito delle antitesi esodiche; non c'è infatti proporzione tra colpa e pena; l'equivalenza tra colpa e pena è soltanto sul piano dei mezzi utilizzati (M. Gilbert, "On est puni par où l'on pèche (Sg 11,16)", *Mél. M. Delcor* [AOAT 215; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985] 183-191; né Cheon né Enns conoscono questo studio; cf. Enns, p. 94 dove si parla piuttosto del principio 'misura per misura'). Nelle antitesi proposte nella terza parte del libro della Sapienza c'è molto più, inoltre, che «God's pedagogy for the righteous» (cf. Cheon, *Exodus Story*, 67).

Entrambi gli autori parlano più volte, specialmente a proposito di Sap 19, di 'nuova creazione' (cf. Cheon, *Exodus Story*, 122-124; Enns, *Exodus Retold*, 72); per essere più precisi occorrerebbe parlare di 'creazione rinnovata', di nuova armonia degli elementi. Il rapporto che entrambi gli autori scoprono, all'interno di Sap, tra creazione ed esodo è davvero molto importante: il Dio che crea è anche quello che salva. Entrambi gli autori sembrano però sottovalutare la dimensione escatologica che caratterizza questi capitoli finali di Sap. Ciò che è avvenuto agli Israeliti e agli Egiziani diviene in realtà modello di ciò che avverrà nel futuro ai giusti e agli empi, come è descritto nella prima parte del libro (Sap 1-6).

Ben più importante, infine, mi sembra un problema che emerge con chiarezza dalla lettura di entrambi i lavori di cui stiamo parlando: il rapporto del libro della Sapienza con il mondo greco. Tale rapporto è pressoché ignorato dai due autori; Enns afferma ad esempio, a proposito di Sap 19,1b, che «adducing Hellenistic parallels will not go very far in explaining Ps. Solomon's comment» (95-96). Il libro della Sapienza mostra invece il suo carattere *midrashico* proprio nella sua capacità di attualizzare, in un contesto greco, il messaggio della Scrittura e della tradizione di Israele. Si può discutere di quale grado di inculturazione si possa parlare: certamente è possibile ridimensionare l'analisi di J.M. Reese (*Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom* [AnBib 41; Rome 1970]), forse troppo sbilanciata sul versante greco; i libri di Enns e Cheon sono molto importanti per la riscoperta del sottofondo biblico e giudaico dello Ps.-Sal. Tuttavia l'aver escluso quasi *a priori* l'analisi del rapporto con il mondo



greco non consente ai due autori di penetrare più a fondo nel metodo usato dallo Ps.-Sal. Gli esempi potrebbero essere numerosi. Si pensi soltanto alla ricchezza del vocabolario utilizzato dallo Ps.-Sal., spesso di chiara impronta filosofica, ai contatti con il mondo dei misteri, evidenti in testi come Sap 16,15-29 e 17,1-18,4; Enns nota possibili rapporti con i misteri isiaci a proposito di Sap 10,17 (62), ma non ne sviluppa le conseguenze (cf. ancora Mazzinghi, *Notte di paura e di luce*, 228-229). Un ulteriore esempio può venire dal testo di Sap 19, commentato da entrambi gli autori: la concezione cosmologica messa in atto dallo Ps.-Sal. è quella comune agli ambienti colti del suo tempo, influenzati dalla filosofia stoica; in particolare è distinguibile in Sap 19,6.18-21 il noto principio greco della interscambiabilità degli elementi e dell'armonia del cosmo; cf. ad esempio D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, (New York 1979) 324-325; P. Beauchamp, "Le salut corporel des justes et la conclusion du livre de la Sagesse", *Biblica* 45 (1964) 491-526 e, dello stesso autore, "Sagesse de Salomon. De l'argumentation médicale à la résurrection", *La sagesse biblique de l'Ancien au Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. Trublet; Paris 1995) 174-186; v. anche lo studio di P.T. Van Rooden, "Die antike Elementarlehre und der Aufbau von Sapientia Salomonis 11-19" (FS J.C.H. Lebram; Leiden 1986) 81-96. È dunque in un linguaggio tipicamente greco che il nostro saggio ripropone la sua visione congiunta di creazione ed Esodo.

Ritengo ben difficile, se non addirittura fuorviante, studiare il libro della Sapienza senza tener presente questo suo continuo aggancio con l'ellenismo. Enns e Cheon non sono i soli a minimizzare i rapporti dello Ps.-Sal. con l'ellenismo sottolineandone quasi esclusivamente l'ebraicità; si veda il recentissimo lavoro di J.M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora* (Edinburgh 1996) 181-191; Barclay, pur non negando l'ellenizzazione dello Ps.-Sal., considera il nostro saggio come un esempio di reazione piuttosto che di integrazione con il mondo greco. Credo che questa via alla fine si possa rivelare persino rischiosa: il contesto ellenistico non è soltanto lo *sfondo* sul quale il nostro autore compone il suo testo: Cheon ha certamente ragione nell'affermare che l'interpretazione biblica offerta dallo Ps.-Sal. ha lo scopo di far crescere «the self-understanding of the Alexandrian Jewish community», dar loro speranza e consolazione e contrastare i pregiudizi anti-semiti dei pagani (Cheon, *Exodus Story*, 149; cf. Enns, *Exodus Retold*, 140-141). Tutto ciò è senz'altro vero, ma non basta: il nostro autore sceglie di far questo attraverso un profondo processo di inculturazione (breve sintesi del problema in Mazzinghi, "Il libro della Sapienza: elementi culturali", *RicStoB* 1-2 [1998] 179-197); non si tratta soltanto, a mio modo di vedere, né di una semplice scelta strategica, né di un pedaggio quasi inconsapevole da pagare all'*esprit du temps*. Si tratta piuttosto di una assunzione consapevole dei valori della cultura ellenistica, attraverso i quali lo Ps.-Sal. ripropone ai suoi uditori un messaggio che è allo stesso tempo profondamente biblico e giudaico.

## Novum Testamentum

P. BÖHLEMANN, *Jesus und der Täufer*. Schlüssel zur Theologie und Ethik des Lukas (SNTS Monograph Series 99). Cambridge, University Press, 1997. xiii-379p. 14,5 x 22. Hardback: £45.00 – \$74.95

In this revised version of his dissertation (Kirchliche Hochschule Bethel, Bielefeld, 1994; supervisor: A. Lindemann) Böhle mann argues that Luke develops his theology and ethics in direct contrast to John the Baptist and his followers. He begins by suggesting that Luke's depiction of the conversion of a group of followers of John the Baptist in Ephesus (Acts 19,1-7) is representative of the type of group Luke seeks to convert to his understanding of the gospel of Jesus. Luke deliberately and systematically contrasts the teaching of Jesus with that of John in an attempt to convert the followers of the Baptist, who favour a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, to the gospel of Jesus. Böhle mann makes it clear from the start that he is not attempting a historical reconstruction of the circumstances around the Baptist group or the Lukan group but is interested in Luke's theology and ethics.

Böhle mann first investigates (in chapter 1) the various passages in Luke 1-4 about John and Jesus (infancy and early public ministry of both). He points to the numerous parallels in the infancy stories of John and Jesus and suggests that Luke is moving Jesus beyond that which is claimed for John: John is greater than other people, but Jesus' greatness carries with it a divine nature; Jesus is to reign over others while John is to prepare the way; John has the prophetic spirit of God while Jesus' birth involves the creative spirit of God. Both the hymns and the stories of Luke 1-2 are developed by Luke from material which originated in the circles of Qumran and the followers of John the Baptist (both of which had a communal self-identity). However, Luke has adapted and edited the traditions to show that "from the beginning" John the Baptist pointed to Jesus as the Christ (40). Luke wants to win them over to the belief that Jesus is the saviour and messiah of God. Further investigation of the contrasts between John and Jesus in Luke 3-4 leads Böhle mann to conclude that his premise is correct: "Lukas entwickelt seine Theologie in Abgrenzung von Gruppen, die Johannes den Täufer favorisierten" (62).

Böhle mann next examines other texts in Luke to see whether they support his hypothesis (cf. 3). In doing so, he organises his investigation around seven motifs in Luke's gospel, devoting one chapter to each motif. The sequence in which these theological motifs are treated corresponds to the sequence in which they occur in Luke's report of the appearance and preaching of John the Baptist in Luke 3. Böhle mann maintains throughout that Luke develops these essential aspects of his theology in contrast to the theology of John the Baptist. He concludes that while John and his followers preached with threats of judgement, Luke depicts Jesus as a forgiving pastoral leader.

The first motif investigated is the pneumatological one. Böhlemann states that Luke's theology is a theology of the Spirit (67). He suggests that Luke has developed his pneumatological emphasis in deliberate contrast to the followers of John the Baptist. In Baptist circles references to the Spirit are indicative of the eschatological cleansing of sins at the judgement. In contrast, for Luke the Spirit is more immediate and carries with it a promise of forgiveness without judgement. Luke frames the Spirit in such a way that the Spirit leads others either to prophesy about Jesus or be baptised in his name. The Holy Spirit is also active in the life of Jesus in the Gospel and the lives of the apostles throughout the book of Acts. In each aspect, Luke's motivation for presenting the Spirit in this way is his dispute with the followers of the Baptist.

The second motif investigated is repentance. Once again Böhlemann sees this motif being developed in Luke's gospel in direct contrast to the motif in the circle of followers of John the Baptist. Unlike John who calls for others to make an act of repentance, God, through Jesus, seeks out the sinner and, through the work of Jesus, makes the debt of the sinner irrelevant.

The third motif is that of "election", although under this category Böhlemann collects a number of different Lukan themes: Abraham and his children, the lowly, wisdom. Most notably, Böhlemann argues that Luke has taken over stories about the childhood of John the Baptist and used them to point to Jesus, particularly in the hymnic material of the infancy narrative and in the speech of Stephen in Acts 7. Luke opposes the individualism of John's preaching with the universalism that comes through Jesus — all Christians are heirs of the promise made to Abraham.

The fourth motif is that of judgement. Böhlemann argues that John the Baptist was not simply a prophet of judgement but also proclaimed salvation. This Luke does not deny. However, Luke contrasts John and Jesus by presenting the latter as bringing baptism with the Holy Spirit rather than fire. For Luke, Jesus brings deliverance, not judgement.

Under the fifth motif, the ethical motif, Böhlemann treats the Lukan themes of poverty, the marginalised, and the practice of faith. In contrast to John's preaching of the way to freedom, Luke presents Jesus' approach as one of the ethics of freedom. Through their baptism with the Holy Spirit and their participation in the Kingdom of God Christians are freed to change their lives radically and, in so doing, go beyond the demands of the Baptist.

The sixth motif explores dominant Christological categories such as Messiah, prophet and Son of Man as applied to Jesus. Böhlemann argues that Luke has taken over traditional ideas about John. While Luke grants that John is a prophet, he makes it clear that John is not the eschatological prophet. Luke also adopted the messianic concept of the followers of the Baptist, who themselves gained it from the Qumran community, and applied it to Jesus. Yet, in contrast to such groups, Luke presents Jesus as the Son of Man coming not as a judge but as a deliverer.

Finally, Böhlemann turns to the eschatological motif. John the Baptist's eschatology is characterised by the nearness of judgement and the hope of forgiveness. For Luke, Jesus fulfils the eschatological event through the proclamation of the Kingdom of God, participation in which is both present

and future. This fulfilment also sums up Böhlemann's entire argument: John the Baptist is among the prophets of old, prophets whose message retains its validity. However, for Luke that message is now fulfilled in Jesus (299). Through him the community participates already in the coming Kingdom of God and is freed from the power of sin and death.

Böhlemann concludes that Luke contrasts Jesus the pastoral leader with the threats of judgement preached by John the Baptist and his followers. In so doing, Luke is attempting to win over the followers of John to the gospel preached by Jesus. In his final chapter Böhlemann briefly summarises the salient results of his investigation for each section of Luke and Acts. He brings this together with a final assessment of the significance of the Baptist group for Lukan theology as a whole. Interspersed within this he includes a short section (313-318) on the evidence for a dispute with the Baptist group in other New Testament texts. This latter section would probably be better placed as an appendix as it introduces a range of new questions.

In general, Böhlemann's overall argument is convincing. Certainly there is a contrast between Jesus and John, with Jesus the clear winner! However, there are some questions that remain. For example, is the competition between Jesus and John really the "key" (Schlüssel) to Luke's theology? The theological motifs highlighted by Böhlemann are certainly important to Luke. Yet, one wonders whether Luke's main concern is to address the followers of John the Baptist to the extent that he would structure his two volume work to meet this purpose. Certainly a conflict with followers of the Baptist makes sense of the various traditions in the first four chapters of the gospel. Yet, if the conversion of followers of the Baptist were of foremost importance to Luke one might reasonably expect that they would show up earlier in Acts as having a deficient understanding of God's plan. Instead, it is not until chapter 18 and Ephesus that they are won over. Why not show a pattern of winning over Baptist followers as the gospel radiates out from Palestine? It is more likely that Luke's concern with the followers of John are one of his many concerns (along with political apologetic, Christology, the cross, etc.; see even recent books in this same series). Like the writer of the Fourth Gospel, Luke has interlocutors on many fronts.

While all of the seven motifs explored by Böhlemann are important in Luke's gospel, one wonders whether each of them is as directly connected to a deliberate contrast with the theology of followers of John the Baptist. One could argue that all of the motifs are found more broadly than just in Luke. This is especially true of Matthew, but is also the case with Mark, John, and the Sayings Gospel (see Mark 1,1-11; Matt 3,1-17; 11,1-19; John 1,19-34; Q 7,18-35). Yet, this concern is not the "key" to their respective theologies, albeit it is an important factor in each of their narratives. It does not seem to me to be any more of a central concern for Luke. In fact, some of Böhlemann's connections seem strained; for example, the suggestion that Jesus' proclamation of liberation in Luke 4,18-19 (quoting Is 61,1-2 and 58,6) is similar to the Baptist's message in Luke 3. Where Böhlemann's argument is strongest is in presenting the contrast between Jesus and John in Luke 1-2. Perhaps a better case could be made for the Baptist as the key to the theology of Luke's infancy narrative. Certainly the presence of

the Baptist in the infancy narrative indicates a concern with this figure among the Lukan community.

Among the motifs that Böhlemann treats the one with the most distinctly Lukan slant is the pneumatological motif. Here the connection with John the Baptist's announcement of forgiveness of sins and Jesus' reception of the Spirit in Luke 3 seem tenuous at best. Evidence for a Baptist circle with any sense of the Holy Spirit seems to be weak; the reference in Mark 1,8 and Q 3,16 to John the Baptist's proclamation of the One coming to baptise with the Spirit and fire seems to be more likely an early *Christian* redaction of Baptist preaching. Yet it is precisely here that Böhlemann sees the primary dispute between Luke and the followers of John the Baptist (cf. 68, 94). Unless one were to argue that all of the gospels have as their primary focus an attempt to counter Baptist circles one fears that Böhlemann has cast his net too wide.

Böhlemann's thesis would be more convincing had Luke focused upon the issue of Jesus' baptism by John, perhaps with a dialogue similar to Matthew 3,14-15 or some other indication that Jesus willingly underwent the baptism (Luke 3,21-22). As it is, Luke simply slides over this scene, placing John in prison before Jesus' baptism (Luke 3,19-20). However, there is no denial of Jesus' baptism by John (as Böhlemann recognises). An ancient reader of Luke's version who already knew of the event (e.g., followers of the Baptist) would find nothing in Luke to counter that picture. Only those who did not know of Jesus' baptism by John would perhaps not assume that John was involved. The overall vagueness of Luke's picture demands some explanation and Böhlemann's brief treatment of this passage (53-55) passes too quickly over its implications.

These comments should not detract from a book well worth reading for those studying Luke-Acts. Böhlemann has some keen insights into Luke's theology and presents his argument clearly.

Queen's Theological College  
Kingston, Ont., Canada, K7L 3N6

Richard S. ASCOUGH

Petr POKORNÝ, *Theologie der lukanischen Schriften* (FRLANT 174).  
Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998. 225p. 16 x 24

Der bekannte Prager Neutestamentler Petr Pokorný (= P.) faßt mit dieser *Theologie der lukanischen Schriften* seine Forschungen an den lukanischen Schriften und zur Christologie des frühen Christentums zusammen. Nachdem in den fünfziger und sechziger Jahren die theologische Leistung des dritten Evangelisten negativ beurteilt wurde (z.B. Vielhauer, Conzelmann, Schulz), wurde herausgestellt, daß der *Auctor ad Theophilum* einen gewichtigen Beitrag zur frühchristlichen Theologie und Ethik leistet. Daran anknüpfend erhebt P. unter kritischer Rezeption der *rhetorischen Analyse*, moderner Metaphertheorien, des *narrative criticism* und des *reader response criticism* die denkerische Gesamtleistung des Verfassers des Lk. Doppelwerkes anhand seiner literarischen Gestalt (11);

dabei wird die auctoriale Verfasserschaft festgehalten, derzufolge der Erzähler durch "seine Theologie die Leser direkt beeinflussen" will (28).

Entscheidende Bedeutung hat der offenbarungstheologische Zeugnisbegriff (Offenbarung Gottes "durch gewisse Ereignisse, welche als seine Offenbarung von den primären oder sekundären Zeugen bezeugt sind"; 11). Obwohl sich P. im Spannungsfeld zwischen *fiction* und *history* nicht zugunsten der erstgenannten Option entscheidet, sondern das lk. Doppelwerk als "interpretierende Wiedergabe" von Jesu Worten und von Geschichte versteht (12), behält der Theologe 'Lukas' letztlich den Vorrang vor dem Historiker. So stellt P. die Zuversicht in die historische Authentizität auf eine kritisch reflektierte Basis, ohne lediglich nur einen fiktionalen Schriftsteller zu erblicken. Allerdings wird 'Lukas' anders als etwa bei G. Strecker, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Hrsg. F.W. Horn) (GLB; New York 1995) 417, nicht aus der Abhängigkeit zu seinen Traditionen verstanden, was etwas zu stark die Sprünge in diesem Werk (z.B. in Apg 15) relativiert. Der Zeugnischarakter spricht nach P. gegen die These der Verobjektivierung der Geschichte im lk. Werk (89). Er schreibt sein Geschichtswerk als Zeugnis über die in der Geschichte ergangene "endgültige (...) Offenbarung Gottes in dieser Welt" (86), so daß theologische und historische Fragestellungen eng verbunden sind.

Der einleitungsgeschichtliche Abschnitt verbleibt im Bereich des kritischen Konsenses. Obgleich der Verfasser den Namen *Lukas* geführt haben kann, ist er weder mit dem gleichnamigen Arzt von Phlm 24; Kol 4,4; 2 Tim 4,11 noch mit einem direkten Paulusschüler zu identifizieren. Die geographischen Kenntnisse (in der Apostelgeschichte zuverlässiger als für den palästinischen Raum) zeigen, daß er aus Griechenland stammt. Hinsichtlich der Quellenfrage legt P. die modifizierte Zwei-Quellentheorie (Mk und QLk) ergänzt durch lk. "Sonderquellen" (20) zugrunde. Für die Apostelgeschichte nimmt P. Aufzeichnungen christlicher Gemeinden an; dies entspricht der literarischen Durchgestaltung der Apg eher als die umfassende *antiochenische Quelle*, mit der P. ebenfalls rechnet. Zudem nimmt er Augenzeugenberichte hinter den Wir-Passagen an. Die direkte Kenntnis einzelner Paulusbriefe schließt P. aus, obgleich er aus dem paulinisch klingenden Apg 13,39 eine Kenntnis und positive Würdigung der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre erschließt (23). Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte sind als Ganzes konzipiert, wobei Jesus als der auferstandene *Kyrios* auch in der Apg die eigentliche Hauptperson ist. Daher wird der Tod des Paulus, von dem Lukas weiß (20,25), nicht berichtet; entscheidend ist allein die freie Verkündigung von Jesus (28,31 [27]). Das Evangelium ist der 'Anfang', der in Apg 'sukzessiv' (Lk 1,3) entfaltet wird; P. kann von einem "zweiten Anfang" als "authentische Reaktion" auf Jesu Verkündigung sprechen (100). Damit wehrt sich P. gegen Conzelmanns dreigliedrige Deutung des lk. Zeitverständnisses (31). Die Zeit der Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes, die dem Täufer folgt, wird von P. insgesamt als Zeit der Kirche verstanden (47). Dies macht deutlich, daß eine Periodisierung des lk. Zeitverständnisses aufgrund von Lk 16,16 nicht eindeutig vollziehbar ist, was auch die Parallelisierung zwischen dem Täufer und Jesus in Lk 1 zeigt. Ist die Zeit der Kirche an Jesus als Geistspender und Inhalt der Verkündigung gebunden, so bleibt m.E. als

Inhalt der Verkündigung und als satansfreie Zeit (Lk 10,18) die Zeit Jesu als die qualifizierte Heilszeit herausgehoben. Der interessante Gedanke, daß in der Leitung der Kirche durch den Geist der Erhöhte die beherrschende Figur in der Apostelgeschichte ist, droht zudem die narrative Funktion des Paulus im Erzählrahmen der Apostelgeschichte zu unterschätzen. Der Weg des Evangeliums zu den Heiden ist betont mit Paulus verbunden, der zunächst als Zeuge der Steinigung des Stephanus (Apg 8,1.3) eingeführt wird, dann in der antiochenischen Mission wirkt (13-14), um schließlich nach dem Bruch mit Barnabas den Weg der Verkündigung nach Griechenland konsequent zu beschreiten (16,9-10).

Die Darstellung der Ekklesiologie bildet neben der Soteriologie einen Hauptteil des Werkes. In der zentralen Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Kirche und Israel vermeidet P. die Extrempositionen der Forschung: 'Lukas' hat die neue Situation der Kirche als Kirche primär aus Heiden theologisch als von Gott gewollt durchdacht, was allerdings "nur in Ansätzen, in einigen Grundtendenzen gelungen" sei (38). Israel ist als "Vergangenheit" (39)/ "Vorgeschichte" (43) der Kirche unvergeßlich mit ihr verbunden: Jesus ist der Messias Israels, der die messianischen Erwartungen des zu seiner Zeit heiligen Gottesvolkes korrigiert (s.a. 111). Die Juden, deren Ablehnung des Heils sich zur Passion Jesu hin steigert und in der Apg ein beständiges Motiv darstellt, sind gespalten; einige bewahren die Verheißung, indem sie Christen werden, andere verbleiben in der Verstockung (47). Die bleibende Gültigkeit des Gesetzes (Lk 16,17) hängt am Zeugnis für den Messias (Lk 24,44), der "die Etappe der unmittelbaren Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes, die Zeiten der Heiden (καίροι ἐθνῶν – Lk 21,24)" eröffnet (48). Durch die Auferstehung als eschatologischem Akt wird die Schrift erfüllt und erhält ihre Autorität (61-62). 'Lukas' bewahrt das AT als *praeparatio evangelica* (81) und als bleibende Grundlage der Kirche im heidnischen Umfeld, indem er den universalgeschichtlichen Aspekt herauskehrt (50). Der Auftrag der Kirche als Mittler zwischen Israel und der Menschheit (52.55-56) besteht in der Überwindung der Unwissenheit der Heiden durch die göttliche Vergebung und der Umkehr durch die fortgesetzte Verkündigung des Gottesreiches; so vergegenwärtigt die Kirche in der Verkündigung das Heil in Jesus (67-71). Dabei ist die spezifische Vorstellung von dem Zwölferkreis "als erste und modellhafte apostolische Antwort" auf Gottes Kommen in Jesus von Bedeutung (76), neben die die geistbegabten Zeugen wie Stephanus und Paulus treten (75-78). Die Kirche repräsentiert die 'ideale Menschheit', da im Glauben der Mensch zu sich selbst und "das moralische Wissen der ganzen Menschheit zur Erfüllung kommt" (66).

Die Herrschaft Christi geschieht indirekt durch das Wirken des Geistes vermittelt der Mission. Dieses Wirken ist "Symbol der in der christlichen Gemeinde antizipierten Eschatologie" (74). Hierin sieht P. eine Uminterpretation des charismatischen Elementes hin zu 'verständlicher Verkündigung' (73). P. postuliert eine lk. Kritik am wunderwirkenden Geist, so daß in Q 11,20 das Austreiben der Dämonen nicht durch den Geist, sondern mit dem Finger Gottes geschehe (72). Allerdings wendet sich Jesus als Geistträger (Lk 4,18) auch in den Wundern den Menschen zu, so daß als Ausdruck der Heilszeit der Nazarethpredigt die Dämonenaustreibung in Kafarnaum (Lk 4,31-37 par Mk 1,21-28) folgt.

Anders als Conzelmann unterscheidet P. zwei Phasen *als* "Mitte" der Geschichte: das irdische Wirken Jesu und die Zeit der Kirche als sein "Widerhall" (100). Das Gericht wird — mit Käsemann — als "Spezialproblem der Historie" begriffen (89). Der Wille Gottes setzt sich in der Geschichte durch, auch und gerade dort, wo die weltliche Ordnung ihre Macht demonstriert; so auch im Kreuz. Die Auferstehung markiert Gottes Zeugnis für Jesus als Messias, so daß "die Entstehung der Kirche als Antwort auf das ganze Leben Jesu" zu begreifen ist (93, 98-99). Die lk. Eschatologie ist mit seiner Ekklesiologie verbunden: In den täglichen Handlungen der Kirche wird das Heil aktualisiert. Diese Aktualisierung greift zurück auf die Zeit Jesu, in der das zukünftige Heil vorweggenommen wurde. Durch das Pfingstwunder werden nicht nur die eschatologischen Verheißungen erfüllt, "(d)ie Erinnerung an Jesus und die Vorwegnahme des Eschatons fallen in eins" (74). So beginnt die Mission der Kirche die erwartete Vollendung am Ende der Zeit, da Jesus bereits die Herrschaft 'im Himmel' angetreten hat (Apg 3,21; 97). Programmatisch ist die Mission universalistisch ausgerichtet; mit der ungehinderten Verkündigung in Rom (Apg 28,28.30-31) als dem damaligen Machtzentrum ist dieser Auftrag erfüllt (103-107). An die Stelle der Parusieerwartung tritt die Stetsbereitschaft (98) mit verantwortlicher Gestaltung der anvertrauten Güter (100-101). Zudem gibt es eine individuelle Hoffnung im Tod getrennt vom Kommen des Reiches Gottes, die jedoch an das Sozialverhalten gebunden ist (102).

Als für die lk. Soteriologie wichtigen Titel verweist P. auf σωτήρ und seine Derivate (118-120); sie umfassen das Heil wie die Rettung vom Gericht. Wendet sich P. gegen eine *direkte* Polemik gegen den Kaiserkult (118), so wird m.E. die Bedeutung dieses Sprachfelds im Herrscherkult unterschätzt, so daß sich Lukas "herausfordernd der Herrscherterminologie der Umwelt" nähert (M. Karrer, *Jesus Christus im Neuen Testament* [GNT 11; Göttingen 1998] 52).

Mit dem Wortfeld 'Sünde' wird die konkrete Situation des Menschen in seiner Unkenntnis Gottes (Apg 17,27) beschrieben. Der Mensch ist auf Vergebung angewiesen, die die Umkehr aus dieser Entfremdung voraussetzt. Dies führt P. unter Aufnahme des textkritischen Apparates in der Analyse von Lk 18,11 vor: Der Pharisäer zeigt seine Entfremdung, indem er in einem inneren Monolog um sich kreist; dem steht die Erkenntnis "der totalen Abhängigkeit von der Gnade Gottes als dem Weg zum Bestehen vor Gottes Gericht und zum (neuen) Leben" gegenüber (127).

Gott als barmherziger Vater aller Menschen steht im Zentrum lk. Soteriologie (128-136): Durch die "Visitation Gottes" in Jesus kommt die Gnade Gottes zur Menschheit (103-105 u.ö.). In Jesus erfüllt sich die Verheißung von Gottes endzeitlicher Sammlung der Verlorenen (Lk 19,10 mit Ez 34,11-16 [136-139]). An die Stelle der Sühnevorstellung tritt das Bild von Gott als barmherzigem Vater, den die Menschheit durch Jesus zu ihrem Heil aus dieser Entfremdung befreiend erkennen kann (142). So wird die Verkündigung des Gottesreiches durch Jesus als "vollmächtige Öffnung des Weges zur Rettung des Menschen aus seiner Entfremdung, die sonst im Tode enden müsse" beschrieben (144); eine Aufgabe, in die die Kirche



im Wirken des Erhöhten hineingenommen ist. Dies sucht P. durch die Auslegung von Lk 15,11-32 zu bewähren (155-176); die Söhne stellen Grundmodelle menschlichen Verhaltens dar, so daß Lukas in ihm die "ganze (...) menschliche (...) Frage" darstellt (161): einerseits der Sohn, der durch Umkehr seine Entfremdung im Verfall an den Konsum und seine Unwissenheit überwindet, andererseits der gerechte Sohn, der im Zorn über die Gnade nicht die Fähigkeit zur Vergebung hat. Dabei läuft die Gnade dem Bekenntnis voraus (168). Daß die Erzählung selbst zu Gott führt (165), ist eine wichtige Beobachtung, die die Frage provoziert, ob mit dieser Erzählung nicht Jesus selbst als Gleichniserzähler zu Wort kommt. Auch wenn P. 'Lukas' nicht zum Inventor der Erzählung macht — er findet Tradition in einer gemeinsamen Wurzel mit Mt 20,1-16 (156-157) — so interpretiert er diesen Text m.E. zu stark als Produkt lk. Soteriologie.

Apologetische Loyalität mit den staatlichen Institutionen und das soziale Interesse sind in der lk. Ethik keine Gegensätze, sondern aufgrund der Bindung an Gott als Schöpfer und Heiland als positive Anknüpfung an die Welt begründet (179). Durch Umkehr und Buße (180-181) soll die Kirche einen alternativen Raum bilden, in der die soziale Verantwortung durch die Verteilung der Güter wahrgenommen wird (164, 190-193). Dies geschieht in der Kirche wie im Leben Jesu durch grenzenlosen Dienst (z.B. die Kollekte) und Einladung des Verlorenen. Gegenüber der Vorstellung, daß Reichtum ein Segen Gottes ist, setzt Lukas das Motiv des eschatologischen Ausgleichs ein: den Reichen wird genommen — den Armen gegeben. Von daher wird die Urkirche als ideale, einen "Konsumkommunismus" lebende, Gemeinschaft dargestellt (Apg 2; 4 [183-185]). Gegenüber der Spannung zu den offensichtlich weiterhin begüterten Christen im lk. Doppelwerk nimmt die Urgemeinde nach Apg 2 und 4 als ideale Antwort (193) auf die Reichgottes-Verkündigung proleptisch die eschatologische Zukunft vorweg und realisiert damit die "edelsten Träume der Menschheit" (189).

P. hat ein solides, die gegenwärtigen Diskussionen vermittelndes Werk vorgelegt: Der 'Lukas', der damit in den Blick tritt, ist ein "synthetischer Geist, der mehrere Gegensätze harmonisieren wollte" (13). So ist P. ein wichtiger Beitrag zur Theologie des lk. Doppelwerkes gelungen, der zu weiterem Gespräch herausfordert. 'Lukas' wird als Theologe seiner Zeit wahrgenommen, indem er vor allem mit Markus und Paulus verglichen und seine Rezeption frühchristlicher Tradition und Geschichte beachtet wird. Dabei konzentriert sich das Interesse auf die synchrone Neuinterpretation, wobei es P. gelingt, die lk. Theologie als einen für die Gegenwart überraschend aktuellen Entwurf vorzustellen. Vor allem die Soteriologie wird als gegenwartsnah interpretiert, da die Neuinterpretation des Sühnenedankens auf die durch Jesus vermittelte Erkenntnis, daß Gott dem Verlorenen zum Heil nachgeht, das gegenwärtige kirchliche und interreligiöse Gespräch befruchten könne (143). Dem entspricht, daß die Areopagrede des Paulus nicht zu einem Fremdkörper der lk. Theologie wird (so aber J. Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* [KEK 3; Göttingen 1997] 453-455), sondern, als Gipfelpunkt der Missionsreden verstanden (132), die Auseinandersetzung mit der menschlichen Kultur zu Recht als elementare Aufgabe authentischer Verkündigung vor der Welt (109) wahrnimmt: Nach

Lukas darf "die christliche Verkündigung menschliche Fragen nicht ignorieren und muß als die Antwort auf menschliche Fragen überprüfbar sein" (108).

Mühlenstraße, 44  
D-38176 Wendeburg

Michael LABAHN

Anders ERIKSSON, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof*. Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians (Coniectanea biblica. New Testament Series 29). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1998. xvi-352p. 16 x 22

The main thesis of this Lund dissertation is "that the connection between the traditions in 1 Corinthians and Paul's text can best be understood when these traditions are seen as part of a rhetorical argumentation" (2). In the first, introductory, chapter Eriksson comments on the subject of his study and provides a brief survey of the three phases of rhetorical criticism in NT studies. The second chapter deals with "the invention of arguments" in rhetoric. In the third chapter the pre-Pauline traditions in 1 Corinthians are studied outside their context; according to Eriksson eight such traditions can be found in the letter: 8,6; 8,11b; 10,16; 11,23-25; 12,3; 12,13; 15,3-5 and 16,22. Chapters 4 to 8 investigate these traditions in their Pauline context, the rhetorical units: One God and Idol Sacrifices (8,1-11,1); Words of Institution and Lord's Supper (11,17-34); Baptism and Spiritual Women (12,1-14,40); Gospel and Resurrection Body (15,1-58); and Maranatha in the Letter's *peroratio* (16,13-24). A brief conclusion is offered in chapter 9. In an appendix the Greek text of the main pericopes is displayed in a rhetorical arrangement (305-313); an extensive bibliography (315-346) and an index of authors follow.

In chapter one it is shown how in modern rhetorical criticism attention has shifted from expression (*elocutio*) to arrangement (*dispositio*) and then, more recently, to invention (*inventio*: "a search for the argumentation, ... for the rhetorical proofs", 10). In chapter two Eriksson indicates the difference between historical and literary critics and, more specifically, contrasts rhetoric in function of a diachronic interpretation with rhetoric as a synchronic analysis of the persuasive argumentation, also called New Rhetoric. Then he justifies his choice of the use of the classical rhetorical theory for his analysis of 1 Corinthians. The key concepts are introduced. The difference between atechnic and technic or entechnic proofs is explained. The last category consists of proofs by *ethos*, by *pathos* and by *logos*. Again, there is a difference between the logical syllogism and the "enthymeme". The rhetorical issue is called *quaestio*; it can be simple (*simplex*) or complex (*coniuncta*), indefinite (*infinita*; more abstract and general) or definite (*finita*; more concrete). The *stasis* of the issue or question is "conjectural" (whether it is) or "definitional" (what it is) or "qualitative" (of what kind it is). Aristotle's well-known three rhetorical

genres are put forward: judicial (or forensic), deliberative and epideictic (or demonstrative). There are five main kinds of cases: honorable, difficult, ambiguous, mean, and obscure. Two rhetorical strategies have to be distinguished: the direct opening (*principium*) and the subtle approach (*insinuatio*; if a direct opening is not possible or advisable). In chapter three a methodological consideration shows the way in which an individual tradition can be isolated. Eriksson also points out how the investigation itself should be conducted: five items of study are needed: isolation, structure, form, *Sitz im Leben*, and interpretation. This five-point approach is then carefully — if somewhat woodenly — adhered to and repeated eight times.

Up till now most readers of the book will have followed Eriksson's exposition without difficulty and most probably not without profit. The problems, however, begin as soon as the author applies his rhetorical criticism to the text units. Before testing this application on one specific unit in detail, four general remarks must be made. First, several times Eriksson announces his approach in a rather triumphalistic way. One is invited to consider rhetorical criticism as an almost magic means, an overall solution. Second, more than once Eriksson disparagingly contrasts his rhetorical analysis with the older thematic analysis approach. Yet the genuine rhetorical approach cannot proceed, it would seem, without much thematic examination. In rhetorical analysis, too, it is the content which decides. It would be deceptive and misleading to claim that the thematic analysis can be given up. Thirdly, Eriksson justly emphasizes the importance of invention in rhetoric, above expression and arrangement, as well as the importance of argumentation and persuasion in language. Yet in his discussion of the particular passages too much attention is again given to the *dispositio* of the text. True, it is repeated more than once that Paul probably was not conscious of his use of such arrangements — they were in the air, it is claimed — but the reader of this book may ask whether Eriksson's proposals do not force Paul's reasoning into the straitjacket of a *dispositio*. Fourth, it must again be asked whether the application of the terminology of classical rhetoric is always a real help to understanding Paul's text. Such a terminology implies the use of abstract names and, after all, leads a step away from the concrete text and content.

But let us, by way of example, consider critically Eriksson's treatment of 1 Cor 15,3-5 (the summary of the gospel, 86-97) and the rhetorical unit 15,1-58 (Gospel and resurrection body, 232-278). The pre-Pauline tradition is dealt with on p. 86-97 and most of what is said here can be accepted as valid. It would seem, however, that the proposed concentric structure of 15,5-7 is hardly correct:

καὶ ὅτι ὡφθῇ Κηφᾶ

a) εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα

b) ἔπειτα ὡφθῇ ἐπάνω πεντακοσίους ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ

c) ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι

c') τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν

b') ἔπειτα ὡφθῇ Ἰακώβω

a') εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν

According to Eriksson the list of witnesses is chiasmically ordered: see εἶτα in *a* and *a'*, ἔπειτα ὁφθῆ in *b* and *b'*. There is a correspondence between the twelve (*a*) and the apostles (*a'*), and between the five hundred brothers (*b*) and James (*b'*). The clauses *c* and *c'* constitute the middle members of the chiasm and contain the central thought. Yet, this concentric structure, although present to some extent, is rather accidental. Verses 5a and 8 are left out in the arrangement; most probably the use of the varied forms εἶτα and ἔπειτα does not have any structural value (cf. vv. 23-24); *a* starts in the middle of a sentence and does not have a verb; the presence of ὁφθῆ in *b* as well as that in *b'* can be explained grammatically, or compositionally. There is, of course, no correspondence between James (*b'*) and the five hundred brothers (*b*). If there is a correspondence between the twelve (*a*) and all the apostles (*a'*), it is rather a parallelism between on the one hand Peter and the twelve (v. 5) and on the other James and all the apostles (v. 7). In no way are *c* and *c'* the most important part of this list. Eriksson writes: "The summary of the gospel would have been the focal point in the symbolic universe shared by Paul and the Corinthians" (96). Yet he assumes too easily, it would seem, that the Gentile converts misunderstood Jewish-Christian traditional terms. So much for the pre-Pauline tradition. Until now rhetorical analysis has not yet entered the scene.

According to Eriksson the tradition is tied up in the argumentation of the deliberative rhetorical unit of chapter 15. Paul specifies the consequence of Christ's resurrection for the resurrection of the Christians. The rhetorical disposition is seen as follows: *exordium* (vv. 1-2); *narratio* (vv. 3-11); *argumentatio* (vv. 12-57); *peroratio* (v. 58). The argumentation proper consists of two rounds, each dealing with a *quaestio finita*: vv. 12-34 (the future resurrection) and vv. 35-57 (the resurrection body). In each of them Paul first presents a *refutatio* (vv. 12-19 and 35-49) and, then, a *confirmatio* (vv. 20-34 and 50-57). The tradition (vv. 3-5) is the *quaestio infinita*; although both Paul and Corinthians accept Christ's resurrection and the Christian's incorporation in Christ, there is, in Paul's opinion, a Corinthian misconception of that common gospel tradition which must be corrected. On the primary level Paul speaks of the future resurrection of dead believers, but on a secondary and deeper, pragmatic level this discourse is directed to the underlying problem of a faulty pneumatic self-understanding ("an overemphasis on the present reality of the resurrection life", 267).

What should be said about this proposal? We must limit ourselves to a few critical remarks. A rhetorical arrangement is not needed in order to detect the threefold division of chapter 15 which is suggested by the caesurae in v. 12 and v. 35. V. 12 clearly introduces a *refutatio* (vv. 12-19, but also vv. 29-32, not fully recognized by the author, see 264-265); however, one does not see how vv. 35-49 constitute a *refutatio* as well (see 267-272). Why should vv. 3-11 be called a *narratio*? Do the narrative elements in the verses justify this technical identification? The term *narratio*, however, may obscure the three concerns (and two shifts) which control Paul's line of thought in these verses. First of all, in vv. 1-3a, as well as in v. 11, Paul stresses his thesis, i.e., the preaching of the same gospel, the basic elements of which he cites in vv. 3b-5. The "sameness"

is indicated, as it were, vertically by reference to the delivering or receiving of the tradition in vv. 1-3a and horizontally by the emphasis on the common gospel in v. 11. A second emphasis is laid on the reality of Christ's resurrection. One should regard the list in vv. 6-8 as an expansion of v. 5. All appearances of the risen Christ establish what is said in v. 4b: Christ is risen. The third concern is the digression found in vv. 9-10. Paul may be the last and least apostle, but qualitatively he is a true apostle. A careful thematic approach reveals the double shift in the argumentation.

Against Eriksson (259-264) one should maintain that the appearances validate Christ's resurrection. In no way is the redactional v. 6bc the center of the list; nor is the emphasis on v. 6c. One can hardly deny that in v. 6b Paul points out that it is possible to check what he has said; v. 6c is rather concessional: "although some have fallen asleep". Is the resurrection of Christ accepted by all the Corinthians? Several details in the text seem to reveal that this not so certain. The list of eyewitnesses may have been intended precisely to remove that doubt. So in vv. 1-11 a *quaestio finita* may be present as well.

Eriksson does not stress enough that the reasoning in vv. 12-32 is not of the logical kind (one exception invalidating the negative general statement, see 257-258), but that of an ontological implication: if Christ is risen, all Christians will rise. Vv. 13-15 and 16-18 are parallel to a large extent. V. 19 is different and functions as a conclusion. Therefore, vv. 12-19 can hardly be taken as a *sortes* of seven [?] conditional clauses. Whether those who say that there is no resurrection of the dead (v. 12) are pneumatic Christians who think that somehow they are already risen remains very doubtful. The wording of v. 12 as well the content of vv. 18-19 and vv. 29-32 rather point to people who do not believe in a life after death. I think that Eriksson's subtle thesis of Christians who misunderstand the common gospel (vv. 3-5) and explain their unity with Christ in the sense of a realized eschatology remains strained and unconvincing.

Also elsewhere in chapters 4-8 of this book it is postulated more than once that Paul and the Corinthians interpreted the tradition in a different way and Paul's argumentation wants to correct the misconceptions. Such "mirror" readings which result in a reconstruction of the rhetorical issue are often quite hypothetical. Criticism can also be raised against the rhetorical arrangements of the units (as if they were mini-speeches), as well as against some reconstructions of the enthymemes. To conclude, it is somewhat disappointing that many objections must be raised against the chapters in this book where the proposed rhetorical approach is used for the study of the traditions and their function in the argumentation within 1 Corinthians. Yet I want to end this critique on a positive note. The text is well written, the reasoning generally sharp and sustained; the distinctions are carefully worked out. Even if the reader does not agree with many of Eriksson's conclusions, the encounter with this author is challenging and certainly profitable.

## Varia

Monika BERNETT – Othmar KEEL (unter Mitarbeit von Stefan MÜNGER), *Mond, Stier und Kult am Stadttor: die Stele von Betsaida (et-Tell)* (OBO 161). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998. viii-175p.- 121 fig. (p. 95-161); color frontispiece. 16 x 23,5. Gebunden: SFr 56 – DM 67 – ÖS 491,—

The University of Nebraska at Omaha has been sponsoring since 1991 (under the direction of Rami Arav and Richard A. Freund) an excavation at the northern tip of the Sea of Galilee: el-Araj on the shore, et-Tell a mile farther north. The site was identified since 1838 as Bethsaida (Julias) and often linked with the Confession of Peter in Mt 16,13, so the enterprise naturally aroused the hopes of New Testament exegetes. However, this volume is concerned exclusively with a cultic area dated about 800 B.C., and such pre-Hellenistic history of the area will of course be welcomed.

We have here in fact the *editio princeps* of a basalt stela (115 x 59 x 31 cm) showing in a relief (raised from the surface 1.5 cm and 102 cm high) a bull standing upright on his hind legs, with a moon-like eight-sliced circle between his horns, and a sword stretching down diagonally from beneath his right foreleg. These features are remarkably clear and well-preserved, though the frontispiece shows the stela to have been broken into three parts, all the way across at the bull's neck, and taking off a corner of his right leg and tail.

Even more remarkable was the similarity of the motifs of this bull-stela to those of the Tell el-Ašari stela in the Damascus National Museum (now redated also to around 800) which had been found re-used in a Roman tomb. This find had been published by S. Ronzevalle; and his Jesuit colleague R. Mouterde has left a drawing from a house-wall, which is apparently our only attestation of a third most remarkably identical depiction. The next item, for which a lesser degree of similarity is claimed on p. 10 (fig. p. 105), is in fact more "stylized" in the fact that the still quite-recognizable features have been largely reduced to rectangularity; it is from Turkey's Gaziantep museum, of unknown origin. Another rather different type of similarity is set forth for the four differently-adorned sides of a bronze box with handles from its top to a ring, published by H. Seyrig in 1959 from a private collection. Finally, and a bit harder to detect, is the kinship to a Saba stela and a cylinder-seal in Berlin.

A study of ten scholars' comment on this already-available comparative material (15-23) shows that *all* the experts considered *all* the items to be from the Roman period, mostly early first century B.C. The discrepancy between this previous unanimous dating and the now archeologically assured 9th/8th century is not stressed in this book as specially horrifying. Rather it is reasonably and ingeniously explained by a fact that had never been noticed (27): how in these art-works had been combined elements both "figurative" (bull's head) and "not-figurative" (in use since 1650 B.C.:

the frame; the rosette, name apparently now preferred for the eight-slice moon). The late-dating criteria applied to *some* of the features may well have been correct: thus (here p. 20) K. Galling, who remains cautiously vague about dating totalities of the compositions.

The Bethsaida bull-stela was on a raised podium with a basin; nearby were three unadorned stelae (p. 3 gives their sites as noted on the plan p. 97 M54 and N53; the third as J54 some twenty metres farther west). The podium was just beside the city gate declared contemporary to the stelae, within a tower less-obviously contemporary. Parallel to the tower is the considerable masonry of a revetment-wall added in the Roman-Hellenistic era.

The cultic interpretation of this area in relation to the Mid-East moon god is given on p. 22-44. Even more fascinating for Old Testament scholars will be p. 45-85 on the relation of this assembly place to the city gate, especially in view of the Dan city gate discovered only in 1966 (here p. 47). One can only wish all further success to Arav and Freund in discovering revolutionary pieces like this, and to the OBO series in making them promptly available in their full scholarly context.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Rome

Robert NORTH S.J.

Étienne NODÉT – Justin TAYLOR, *Essai sur les origines du christianisme*. Une secte éclatée (Initiations Bibliques). Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1998. xv-429p. 13,5 x 21,5. FF 195

The study of Christian origins is elusive but irresistible. It requires the instincts and persistence of a detective. We know that the New Testament books alone do not give us the whole story. The persistent references to James the Lord's brother in various early Christian texts are enough to prove that. We need to take whatever clues we can find, and try then to make sense out of the whole. The traditional questions of this undertaking include the following: Can we establish the exact matrix within Judaism for Jesus and the early Christian movement? Why did Jesus become the focus? And why did his movement continue and succeed? Two-thousand years later both academic historians and the general public are fascinated by these questions.

Two professors at the École Biblique de Jérusalem — Nodet, a Dominican and specialist in Josephus and postbiblical Judaism, and Taylor, a Marist and an exegete best known for his many publications on Acts — have combined to present a fresh hypothesis that takes the rituals of baptism and the Eucharist as the starting point. The academic study of Christian origins has generally been a Protestant enterprise, and often driven by Protestant theological presuppositions, as Jonathan Z. Smith in *Drudgery Divine*. On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity (Chicago 1990) has shown. And so it is good to see two

Catholic scholars take up the task from an "institutional" perspective that has not been tried before. Moreover, the École Biblique de Jérusalem has been one of the great centers for biblical research for over a hundred years. And it is also good to see how the projects of distinguished members of its faculty (especially Marie-Émile Boismard) might contribute to a full-scale theory of Christian origins. The English version of the book is published by Liturgical Press under the title *The Origins of Christianity: An Exploration* (Collegeville, MN 1998).

The authors' main thesis is that the two basic rituals of the early Christians — baptism and the Eucharist — are closely related and were originally connected to an Essene milieu. Like the Essenes, the early Christians regarded themselves as the true Israel and the exclusive restorers of the covenant, existed on the margins of Judaism and far from the Jerusalem authorities, and used baptisms and communal meals as key ways of celebrating their identity and significance.

With regard to the traditional concerns involved in studying Christian origins, the authors point to the Essene movement broadly understood as the Jewish matrix for the early Christian movement. They regard the kerygma about Jesus' death and resurrection to be a more important focus than what can be gained from the quest for the historical Jesus. And they judge that the experience of the Holy Spirit and the growing recognition of Jesus' theological significance were fundamental to the survival and growth of early Christianity.

On the whole, this volume is a remarkably original and stimulating contribution to the study of Christian origins. Besides giving a comprehensive presentation of the development of Christianity in the first two centuries A.D., it is full of fresh readings of Jewish and Christian texts. One can only admire the authors' great learning, scholarly ingenuity, and familiarity with current scholarship. In discussing their proposals, I will comment in passing on various methodological problems that arise.

The initial two chapters express the authors' basic insights. They first discuss the nature of the sources and propose two episodes in Acts as a point of departure. Then they contend that the Christian rituals of baptism and the Lord's Supper depend on Jewish (Essene) precedents. The remaining five chapters develop the historical foundations of the thesis. They deal with Galilee until the time of Jesus; Galilee until the Mishnah; Nazoreans and Jews in Palestine; the mission from Jerusalem to Ephesus; and Passover, Pentecost, and covenant.

The authors first explain why one cannot solve the problems of Christian origins by simply reading the New Testament books. The process from writing, to circulation and acceptance, and finally to canonization was long and complex, and early Christianity (like the Essene and rabbinic movements) was primarily oral and practiced a certain reserve toward making public their most important rituals and beliefs. Then to illustrate the importance of baptism and the Eucharist in earliest Christianity, they appeal to a reconstruction of the Cornelius episode with its focus on baptism according to the hypothetical Petrine Document (prior to both the Western and Alexandrian texts of Acts) and to the account of Paul's farewell visit to Troas in Acts 20,7-12 as a symbolic eucharistic narrative, respectively.



Taking these episodes as points of departure, however, does not inspire confidence, due to the hypothetical nature of the source analysis in the first case and to the allegorical interpretation in the second case.

The arguments for the Jewish roots of baptism and the Eucharist in the second chapter are more persuasive. By sifting through the sources (biblical and Josephus), the authors suggest that John's baptism (as at Qumran) was more a process of initiation than a quasi-magical action, and that the early Christians conferred on a preexistent ritual a new meaning that involved the gift of the Holy Spirit, the "name" of Jesus, and sharing in his death and resurrection. In dealing with the Eucharist, the authors provide an excellent summary and critique of Joachim Jeremias's proposal that the Last Supper was a true Passover meal. Adopting a modified version of Annie Jaubert's two-calendar hypothesis, they then find the roots of the Last Supper in the daily and festive meals of the Essenes — to which Jesus and the early Christians gave a new meaning.

Though at first sight something of a long interlude, the two chapters on Galilee contribute to the argument by establishing first the social marginality of Galilee and then the religious-nationalist ferment and creativity that came to mark the Jewish population of the region. That Galilee was marginal in Jewish life up to the time of Jesus is indicated by the rural nature of its population patterns, the curious social and political status of its people, the prominence of "brigands" and other revolutionaries there, the arrival of Hillel from Babylon and his rise to prominence, and the profile of Jesus of Nazareth as a "rabbi" and *hāsîd*.

Nevertheless, in the period from around A.D. 70 to 200, Galilee became the center of Jewish renewal. Particular attention is given in the second chapter on Galilee to the religious-nationalist nature of Josephus' mission to Galilee, the founding of the school at Yavneh (outside the jurisdiction of Judea) and its influence in Galilee, the efforts of Gamaliel II at reorganizing the people without the Temple cult, the movement of refugees from the Bar Kokhba revolt to Galilee and the struggle between them and the less political rabbis, and the eventual influence of Galilee on Diaspora (especially Babylonian) Jews.

Within this historical framework the authors treat Nazoreans and Jews in Palestine. They propose that the Mishnah arose in early rabbinic confraternities (*ḥābūrôt*) of an Essene type, which also provided the pattern for the early Christian communities. They suggest that the rabbis eventually opened their system of confraternities (for which proselyte baptism served as an entrance ritual) to all the Jewish people (for whom circumcision sufficed as an entrance ritual). Meanwhile at Jerusalem, James the Lord's brother and his successors as "bishops" represented a traditional Jewish Christianity that was concerned not so much with Gentile Christians as with Gentiles who converted to God and so were obliged to follow the Noahide commandments — an interpretation based on the reconstruction of the Petrine Document underlying Acts 15. These Jewish Christians and the even more conservative Ebionites posed little threat to other Jews (including the early rabbis) and so gained little attention from them. They were simply regarded as sects among the many sects that constituted Judaism in this period.

Two serious methodological problems arise in this middle part of the book. The appeal to the "Essenes" and their influence becomes so widespread that their "marginal" status is endangered. According to the authors, the Essenes influenced the Pharisees and the early rabbis as well as the early Christians, thus providing the pattern for the continued existence and revival of Judaism. But the reader wonders whether this is another manifestation of pan-Qumranism or pan-Essenism by which one shadowy entity is used to explain many other shadowy entities. Also, with their appeal to a primitive Jewish Christian Gospel (proto-Matthew) from around A.D. 90 to 100 and a Gospel harmony around 120 (a kind of Diatessaron), the authors delay the composition of the canonical Gospels well into the second century and explain Mark's Gospel as the end product in a Griesbachian process (i.e. as a synthesis of the two traditions represented by Matthew and Luke).

How did a Jewish sect rooted in Galilee and very close to the Essenes open itself up to pagans? From a historical perspective this was a gradual process. From a theological perspective it was an explosion or *cataclysm* (and so the subtitle *Une secte éclatée*). With reference to key texts in Acts, the authors trace the ideological as well as the geographical spread of the Christian movement. They situate the early missionary efforts as remaining within Judaism and aimed at attracting other Jews to the messianic perspective associated with Jesus. This brand of Jewish messianism, however, aroused suspicion among the Romans, as exemplified by the expulsion of Jews from Rome under Claudius (*impulsore chresto*). The great shifts in perspective happened in connection with the gift of the Holy Spirit at the "second Pentecost" (Acts 4,31-35) and with the growing recognition that the risen Jesus was the Messiah who had already come. But even here with the use of *plēthos* to describe the Christian community at Jerusalem, the Essene roots show through, since *ha-rabbīm* in the Qumran texts was a designation for members of the Essene community.

The methodological problem at this point and elsewhere in the book is the weight placed on Boismard and Taylor's source-critical analysis of Acts. Unlike most scholars, they place the Western Text (represented in part by Codex Bezae but not identical with it) prior to the Alexandrian Text. Moreover, they contend that it is possible to reconstruct coherent sources (not just traditions or information) behind those textual traditions. Then the Western Tradition and the sources underlying it (the "Petrine Document" and the "Travel Journal") become the basis for reconstructing the development of earliest Christianity. There is, of course, a necessary circularity here between literary and historical hypotheses. Rather than dismissing the authors' work on that ground, however, we might better see it as part of their effort at verifying both hypotheses. Nevertheless, those who remain unconvinced by the literary hypothesis will probably not be convinced by the historical hypothesis, and vice versa.

The final chapter first compares the Christian and tannaitic approaches to Passover and Pentecost, and highlights the covenantal dimensions ascribed to those festivals in Christian and Essene circles. Next it calls upon Qumran sectarian texts and the descriptions of the Essenes by Josephus and Philo to illumine early Christian initiation procedures, the

common meal, and community structures and offices. Finally it reflects on the Jewish roots of the symbolism attached to anointing (and its possible to connection to the name *christiani*) and the cross.

A final methodological point. One wonders about the relationship of all these interesting institutional and theological developments to the historical Jesus. The authors express (on 421-423) skepticism about the methods and the results of the quest for the historical Jesus. And their late dating of the canonical Gospels and the very complicated process that they postulate for the transmission of the traditions about Jesus seem to make the links to the historical Jesus even more tenuous than in most other theories of Christian origins. But how is it that the movements focused on the emperor Augustus and the Teacher of Righteousness have disappeared, while the one focused on Jesus of Nazareth is at the dawn of its third millennium? Does not the success of the Christian movement demand a strong historical figure behind the institutions and texts that purport to bear witness to him?

Weston Jesuit School of Theology  
3 Phillips Place  
Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

Daniel J. HARRINGTON, S.J.

P.-E. DION, *Les Araméens à l'âge du fer*. Histoire politique et structures sociales (Études bibliques 34). Paris, Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup>, Éditeurs, 1997. 472p., 21 illustrations, 3 cartes. 16 x 24. FF 390

Professor Dion's book on the Arameans is a very comprehensive work and seems to offer the reader an analysis of everything which so far is known about this people through inscriptions and archaeological finds. The results of previous authors who have treated the same topic are naturally referred to, and scrutinised and commented on in the notes, as are all the inscriptions related to the topic, as well as those found outside Syria.

Dion has divided his book very pedagogically into two parts. In the first he treats the origin of the Arameans, their expansion, and political history in all the areas where they appeared. We know them through inscriptions of their own and through the traditions of their enemies, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Israelites, and other ethnic groups who lived in Syria. In the Iron I-period the Arameans can be characterised more or less as breeders and villagers with cultural traditions going back to Amorite times. They lived in the Neo-Hittite states and cities. It is difficult to discern what is genuine Aramean culture at that time, but there soon appeared strong kings and generals and the Arameans were able to sack citadels and towns and create kingdoms of their own. The impact of Phoenician culture, religion and language was reduced. They succeeded in penetrating east of the Tigris and although they were in a minority they seized power in many areas. In order to get an understanding of the diverse nature of the Arameans, Dion divides them into a northern and a southern

group with the demarcation line drawn east-west on a level with the sources of the Orontes at Lebwe south of Hamath. He may have done so for historical-ideological reasons, as the Old Testament keeps Lebo Hamath as a northern border point both of Canaan and of the Davidic empire. Dion regards Lebwe as identical with Lebo, whose connection with Hamath is artificial (166-167). The main groups of Arameans lived in northern and northeastern Syria but in a very complex world as regards the strata of the population. Dion deals with a large number of inscriptions written in languages current at that time, such as Hurrian, Ugaritic, Neshitic, Luvian, Phoenician, Assyrian, Babylonian, and, of course, Aramaic and has succeeded in putting many pieces of the historical and geographical puzzle together.

In Part One (13-170) he has made a thorough investigation about geography, archaeology, history and religion. The iron age history is very well written. One can follow the Assyrian and Babylonian armies passing through Gebel Bishri, get to know the names of the cities, the names of the main kings, and find them forming coalitions in order to resist the pressure from the east. But the Arameans were also able to make their way deep into traditional Assyrian and Babylonian areas and settle there.

The northern Arameans were the first to be subjugated around 850 B.C. There were large kingdoms, such as Bit-Adini, Sam'al, Arpad and Hamath-Lu'ush with its first Aramean king, Zakkur. It took the Assyrians two hundred years of warfare to pacify northern Syria. With the fall of Hamath in 720 the southern part of Syria and the road to Palestine were open. Ribla "in the country of Hamath" was then a central and convenient billet for kings on war expeditions in Syria.

In the south the kingdom of Damascus was naturally the main Aramean centre together with Ashtaroth. The name "Aram" is especially connected with Damascus. The Old Testament is the main source for a picture of Aramean confrontations with Israel and Judah. Dion offers 46 pages (171-216) on the conflicts in the triangular drama between Arameans-Israelites and the ever-alert Assyrians. This section is very useful, especially for OT-scholars, showing that biblical texts often use telescoped history writing.

Inscriptions found so far are few. It is difficult to prove historically the episodes they recount. Although archaeological activity has been extensive east-northeast of Lake Kinneret and in the Golan there are very few finds which mention an Aramean hegemony. In the years 1990-1994 a Scandinavian team at Tall al-Fukhar, 6 kms west of Ramtha, tried to find red polished pottery typical of the Iron II A-B-periods but found just three sherds on the surface. There were no structural remains of any kind from these periods. But the transitional period, LB II B-Iron I A, can be well documented. At that time some breeders and villagers lived there in a poor settlement, constructed with the remains of the Bronze Age town which had had double walls. The wars between the Arameans and the Israelites, according to the OT, were fought mostly at Ramoth Gil'ad in northern Jordan. The archaeological sources are mostly silent about this. One of my students, C.-J. Axskjöld, who was part of the expedition to Tall al-Fukhar, recently defended his doctoral thesis on the Arameans in the OT. But he gave it the title *Aram as the Enemy Friend*. The Ideological Role of Aram

in the Composition of Genesis–2 Kings (Uppsala 1998). Dion's sceptical view on the use of biblical texts for writing the history of Aram is not far from Axskjöld's.

The second part of Dion's book (224-366) treats the society of the Arameans and their institutions. The states were more territorial than ethnic. They contained strong non-Aramean elements. In the most important states the kingdom seems to have been hereditary. A brother could sometimes succeed a brother. All kings were installed by the main god (Hadad, Ba'al Shamayn, etc.) who put the sceptre into their hand. The deceased king was not deified. At the funeral of Panamuwa the worshippers addressed prayers to a statue of Hadad. The organisation of the royal court was the same as in other states. The Arameans succeeded in building up a strong army with a developed arsenal, such as war-chariots, cavalry, bows and swords. At Qarqar in the year 853 B.C. Damas could muster 1200 chariots, 1200 cavalymen and 20000 foot-soldiers. They defended their cities with very advanced means and used double, sometimes elliptical, walls often furnished with moats. The Assyrians might need up to three years of siege before capturing a town. Guerilla war could be waged from the mountains. There are no texts mentioning the use of the ban, which was common among the neighbouring peoples.

The last chapter of the book treats the economy of the Arameans. Aramean groups kept control of important centres of trade and the camel was a very popular and useful animal. Dion does not treat the question of when it was domesticated. He mentions the find of camel bones at Tell Afis (344, note 93). The Scandinavian expedition to Tall al-Fukhar found three camel teeth next to an oven, dated to LB II B-Iron I A. The site is thought to have been in an Aramean area.

The book contains 21 well-chosen illustrations which offer the reader an idea of what gods and people looked like in Aramean times. Three maps are included, along with a most valuable bibliography which includes most works on the topic and indexes of proper names, social economy, Aramean epigraphy and authors. Dion's book is an enormous work of scholarship; if one also considers the substantial footnotes, it is almost impossible to find anything which could be missing. The spread of the Aramean language is fascinating to follow through deportations, trade etc.; it even reached the upper classes of Assur and Babylon.

Dion makes us note the absence of any reference to southern Arameans outside the Old Testament. Remains from the main Aramean period, Iron II A-B, are more or less missing south of the Yarmuk river. But then most archaeological work done here dates from the fifties and sixties, when traditions found in the OT had a strong impact on interpretation.

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1998-1999. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 377, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	18	320	25	363
Fac. Orientalistica	—	3	11	14
Universi	18	323	36	377
Nationes	61		Alumni	377
Dioceses	183		Alumni	207
Inst. Religiosorum	45		Alumni	122
Inst. Religiosarum	13		Alumnae	13
Ex statu laicali	35		Alumnae	21
			Alumni	14

### Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica dignus declaratus est:

AGUILAR CHIU, José Enrique (22.03.99) *La justificación y el Espíritu en S. Pablo* (magna cum laude). Moderator: A. Vanhoye.

DUS, Alfredo (04.05.99) *Las parábolas del Reino de Judá. Lingüística textual y comunicación (Ez 17; 19; 21)* (magna cum laude). Moderator: H. Simian-Yofre.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

MILER, Jean, *Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile de Matthieu*. (AnBib 140) Roma 1999.

GIENIUSZ, Andrzej, *Romans 8:18-30: "Suffering Does Not Thwart the Future Glory"*. (International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism) Atlanta, GA 1999.

BAZYLIŃSKI, Stanisław, *I Salmi 20-21 nel contesto delle preghiere regali*. Roma 1999.

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a *Biblica*, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto juicio acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensionados en *Biblica*.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por *Biblica* no serán devueltos al remitente, aún cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a *Biblica* se trasmiten al Editor del *Elenchus of Biblica*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Envíense los libros a: Dirección *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, via della Pilotta, 25 I-00187 Roma, Italia.

**Aranda Pérez, Gonzalo – García Martínez, Florentino – Pérez Fernández, Miguel**, *Letteratura giudaica intertestamentaria*. Edizione italiana a cura di Donatella Maggiorotti (Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia 9). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 501p. 15,6 x 23. Lit. 79.000

**Axskjöld, Carl-Johan**, *Aram as the Enemy Friend*. The Ideological Role of Aram in the Composition of Genesis–2 Kings (ConBib OT 45). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1998. 183p. 16,3 x 23,1. SEK 184,—

**Balz, Horst – Schneider, Gerhard**, *Dizionario Esetico del Nuovo Testamento* 2. Κερχραί – ὠφέλιμος. Edizione italiana a cura di Omero Soffritti. Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 2046-22\*p. 17 x 25

**Bandera, Armando**, *La Iglesia de Roma*. Leyendo el Apocalipsis. Salamanca, 1999. 167p. 17 x 23,9

**Bartholomew, Craig G.**, *Reading Ecclesiastes*. Old Testament Exegesis and Hermeneutical Theory (AnBib 139). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1998. viii-319p. 16,5 x 24. Lit. 45.000 – \$30.00

**Beale, G.K.** *The Book of Revelation* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary). Grand Rapids – Cambridge, Wm.B. Eerdmans – Carlisle, UK, The Paternoster Press, 1999. lxiv-1245p. 16,2 x 24,4. \$75.00

**Bond, Helen K.**, *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation* (SNTS Monograph Series 100). Cambridge, University Press, 1998. xxvi-249p. 14,7 x 22,2. £37.50 – \$59.95

**Bossuyt, Philippe**, *L'Esprit en Actes*. Lire les Actes des Apôtres (Le livre et le rouleau 3). Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius, 1998. 174p. 14,5 x 24,4. FF 119 – FB 715,—

**Bovon, François – Brock, Ann Graham – Matthews, Christopher R.** (eds.), *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* (Harvard Divinity School Studies). Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions, 1999. xxx-394p. 16 x 23,5. Cloth: \$34.95 – £21.95; paper: \$24.95 – £15.50

**Brenk, Frederick E.**, *Relighting the Souls*. Studies in Plutarch, in Greek Literature, Religion, and Philosophy, and in the New Testament Background. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998. 420p. 16,9 x 24. DM/SFr 128 – ÖS 934,—

**Brown, Schuyler**, *Text and Psyche*. Experiencing Scripture Today. New York, Cassel & Continuum, 1998. 141p. 14,4 x 21,5. \$18.95

**Casey, Maurice**, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (SNTS Monograph Series 102). Cambridge, University Press, 1998. x-278p. 14,7 x 22,2. £37.50 – \$59.95

**Chrysostome, Jean**, *Sermons sur la Genèse*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Laurence **Brottier** (SC 433). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1998. 405p. 12,5 x 19,9. FF 238

**Clines, David J.A.**, *On the Way to the Postmodern*. Old Testament Essays, 1967-1998. Volume I (JSOTSS 192). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. xx-443p. 16 x 24. £50.00 – \$85.00

**Clines, David J.A.**, *On the Way to the Postmodern*. Old Testament Essays, 1967-1998. Volume II (JSOTSS 192). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. i-xiv-444-897. 16 x 24. £50.00 – \$85.00

**Coetze, Andries W.**, *Tiberian Hebrew Phonology: Focusing on Consonant Clusters* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 38). Assen, Van Gorcum, 1999. xii-215p. 16,2 x 24,7. Dfl 140,—

**Collins, Adela Yarbro** (ed.), *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture*. Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz. Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1998. xvi-452p. 15,5 x 23,5. \$59.95

**Conrad, Edgar W.**, *Zechariah* (Readings: A New Biblical Commentary). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 220p. 16 x 24. Cloth: £35.00 – \$57.00; paper: £13.95 – \$23.75

**Cothenet, Édouard**, *Exégèse et liturgie II* (Lectio Divina 175). Paris, Le Cerf, 1999. 261p. 13 x 21,5. FF 175

**Cryer, Frederick H.** – **Thompson, Thomas L.** (eds.), *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSS 290 – Copenhagen International Seminar 6). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 398p. 16 x 24. £55.00 – \$85.00

**Dabourne, Wendy**, *Purpose and Cause in Pauline Exegesis*. Romans 1.16–4.25 and a New Approach to the Letters (SNTS Monograph Series 104). Cambridge, University Press, 1999. xii-257p. 14,3 x 22,2. £37.50 – \$59.95

**Davis, Casey Wayne**, *Oral Biblical Criticism*. The Influence of the Principles of Orality on the Literary Structure of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (JSNTSS 172). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 199p. 16 x 24. £35.00 – \$57.50

**Day, John** (ed.), *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar (JSOTSS 270). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 528p. 16 x 24. £55.00 – \$85.00

**De Jonge, Marinus**, *God's Final Envoy*. Early Christology and Jesus' Own View of His Mission. Grand Rapids, Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1998. x-166p. 15,1 x 22,8. \$18.00 – £11.99

**De Regt, Lénart J.**, *Participants in Old Testament Texts and the Translator*. Reference Devices and their Rhetorical Impact (Studia Semitica



Neerlandica 39). Assen, Van Gorcum, 1999. viii-119p. 16,2 x 24,7. Dfl 140,—

**Déclais**, Jean-Louis, *David raconté par les musulmans* (Patrimoines – Islam). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1999. 332p. 14,6 x 23,5. FF 185

**Desrousseaux**, Louis – **Vermeylen**, Jacques (éds.), *Figures de David à travers la Bible*. XVIIe congrès de l'ACFEB (Lille, 1er-5 septembre 1997) (LD 177). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1999. 481p. 13,5 x 21. FF 220

**Disse**, Andreas, *Informationsstruktur im Biblischen Hebräisch*. Sprachwissenschaftliche Grundlagen und exegetische Konsequenzen einer Korpusuntersuchung zu den Büchern Deuteronomium, Richter und 2 Könige (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 56/1). St. Ottilien, Eos Verlag, 1998. 418p. 14,8 x 21

**Disse**, Andreas, *Informationsstruktur im Biblischen Hebräisch*. Sprachwissenschaftliche Grundlagen und exegetische Konsequenzen einer Korpusuntersuchung zu den Büchern Deuteronomium, Richter und 2 Könige. Anhang: Text und Register (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 56/2). St. Ottilien, Eos Verlag, 1998. 83p. 14,8 x 21

**Dombrowski**, Bruno W.W., *Wider die Hellenisierung jüdischer Religion: Hellenisierung jüdischen Erbes und Lebens*. Die Qumran-Assoziation nach dem 'Manual of Discipline' (QS). Erster Band (Qumranica Mogilanensia 16). Kraków, The Enigma Press, 1998. 395p. 16 x 21,5

**Espinell Marcos**, José Luis, *Evangelio según San Juan*. Introducción, traducción y comentario (Horizontes dos mil – textos y monografías 11). Salamanca, San Esteban – Madrid, Edibesa, 1998. 286p. 14,7 x 23,5

**Exum**, J. Cheryl – **Moore**, Stephen D. (eds.), *Biblical Studies / Cultural Studies*. The Third Sheffield Colloquium (JSOTSS 166 – Gender, Culture, Theory 7). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 506p. 16 x 24. Cloth: £50.00 – \$85.00; paper: £19.95 – \$29.95

**Fabris**, Rinaldo (a cura di), *La parola di Dio cresceva (At 12,24)*. Scritti in onore di Carlo Maria Martini nel suo 70° compleanno (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 33). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1998. 597p. 17 x 24. Lit. 55.000

**Fausti**, Silvano, *Una comunità legge il vangelo di Matteo*. Volume primo (cc. 1–13) (Lettura pastorale della Bibbia 29). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1998. 284p. 17 x 24. Lit. 33.000

**Fedalto**, Giorgio, *Quando festeggiare il 2000? Problemi di cronologia cristiana*. Cisinello Balsamo (MI), Edizioni San Paolo, 1998. 98p. 13,4 x 21. Lit. 14.000

**Feldman**, Louis H., *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 27). Berkeley – Los Angeles – London, University of California Press, 1998. xvi-837p. 16 x 23,6. \$75.00 – £55.00

**Fernández Marcos**, Natalio, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*. 2a edición revisada y aumentada (Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 64). Madrid, Instituto de Filología del Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1998. 412p. 17 x 24

**Ferraro**, Giuseppe, *Lo Spirito Santo nei commentari al Quarto Vangelo di Bruno Segni, Ruperto di Deutz, Bonaventura e Alberto Magno*

(Lectures bibliche 11). Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1998. 222p. 17 x 24. Lit. 30.000

**Fewell**, Danna Nolan – **Phillips**, Gary A. (eds.), *Bible and Ethics of Reading* (Semeia 77). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1997. vi-290p. 15,3 x 23,4. \$19.95

**Frades Gaspar**, Eduardo, *El uso de la Biblia en los escritos de Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas* (Colección Santa Rosa de Lima 2). Caracas, Instituto Universitario Seminario Interdiocesano Santa Rosa de Lima, 1997. 554p. 13,3 x 20,2

**Garbini**, Giovanni, *Note di lessicografia ebraica* (Studi biblici 118). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 198p. 13,5 x 21. Lit. 33.000

**García Santos**, Amador-Angel, *El Pentateuco*. Historia y sentido (Horizontes dos mil – textos y monografías 12). Salamanca, San Esteban – Madrid, Edibesa, 1998. 292p. 14,7 x 23,5

**Glonner**, Georg, *Zur Bildersprache des Johannes von Patmos*. Untersuchung der Johannesapokalypse anhand einer um Elemente der Bildinterpretation erweiterten historisch-kritischen Methode (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen – Neue Folge 34). Münster, Aschendorff Verlag, 1999. x-300p. 16,3 x 24. DM 88,—

**Gogel**, Sandra Landis, *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew* (SBL Resources for Biblical Studies 23). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1998. xx-522p. 15,5 x 23,5. \$44.95

**Grottanelli**, Cristiano, *Sette storie bibliche* (Studi biblici 119). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 315p. 13,5 x 21. Lit. 48.000

**Guijarro Oporto**, Santiago, *Fidelidades en conflicto*. La ruptura con la familia por causa del discipulado y de la misión en la tradición sinóptica (Plenitudo temporis 4). Salamanca, Universidad Pontificia, 1998. 473p. 17 x 24. Paper: Ptas 3.000; cloth: Ptas 3.600

**Guthrie**, George H., *The Structure of Hebrews*. A Text-Linguistic Analysis (Biblical Studies Library). Grand Rapids, Baker Books, 1998. xx-161p. 15,2 x 22,8. \$16.99

**Harrington**, Wilfried J., *Matthew: Sage Theologian*. The Jesus of Matthew. Dublin, The Columba Press, 1998. 116p. 11,7 x 21,3. £8.99

**Harris III**, W. Hall, *The Descent of Christ*. Ephesians 4:7-11 and Traditional Hebrew Imagery (Biblical Studies Library). Grand Rapids, Baker Books, 1998. xvii-221p. 15,2 x 22,9. \$19.99

**Harvey**, John D., *Listening to the Text*. Oral Patterning in Paul's Letters (Evangelical Theology Studies). Grand Rapids, Baker Books – Leicester, UK, Apollos, 1998. xviii-357p. 15,2 x 22,8. \$24.99

**Hayes**, Michael A. – **Porter**, Wendy – **Tombs**, David (eds.), *Religion and Sexuality* (Studies in Theology and Sexuality 2 – Roehampton Institute London Papers 4). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 438p. 16 x 24. Cloth: £40.00 – \$65.00; paper: £19.95 – \$29.95

**Hengel**, Martin, *La questione giovannea* (Studi biblici 120). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 339p. 13,5 x 21. Lit. 48.000

**Hock**, Ronald F. – **Chance**, J. Bradley – **Perkins**, Judith (eds.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative* (SBL Symposium Series 6). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998. x-309p. 15,7 x 23,6. \$49.95

**Hoerth**, Alfred J., *Archaeology and the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Baker Books, 1998. 447p. 19 x 26. \$44.99

**Hoffner**, Harry A., *Hittite Myths*. Second Edition (SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 2). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998. xii-120p. 15 x 22,6. \$14.95

*L'interpretazione della Bibbia nella Chiesa*. Testo della Pontificia Commissione Biblica. Commento a cura di Giuseppe **Ghiberti** e Francesco **Mosetto** (Percorsi e traguardi biblici). Leumann (To), Editrice Elle Di Ci, 1998. 387p. 15 x 21. Lit. 40.000

**Jaruzelska**, Izabela, *Amos and the Officialdom in the Kingdom of Israel*. The Socio-economic Position of the Officials in the Light of the Biblical, the Epigraphic and Archaeological Evidence (Sociologia 25). Poznań, Adam Mickiewicz University Press, 1998. 239p. 17 x 24

**Kern**, Philip H., *Rhetoric and Galatians*. Assessing an Approach to Paul's Epistles (SNTS Monograph Series 101). Cambridge, University Press, 1998. xiv-304p. 14,7 x 22,2. £37.50 – \$59.95

**Koole**, Jan L., *Isaiah III*. Volume 2: *Isaiah 49-55*. English translation by Anthony R. Punia (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament). Leuven, Peeters, 1998. xxvi-454p. 16 x 24. BF 1800,—

**Krašovec**, Jože (ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible*. The International Symposium in Slovenia (JSOTSS 289). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 1909p. 17,5 x 24,7

**Kugel**, James, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry*. Parallelism and Its History (Reprint). Baltimore – London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. xii-339p. 15,5 x 23,5

**Laniak**, Timothy S., *Shame and Honor in the Book of Esther* (SBL Dissertation Series 165). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998. xiv-205p. 14,4 x 22,2. \$34.95

**Légasse**, Simon, *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniens* (Lectio Divina – Commentaires 7). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1999. 448p. 13,4 x 21,5. FF 250

**Liverani**, Mario (a cura di), *Le lettere di el-Amarna*. 1. Le lettere dei "Piccoli Re" (Testi del Vicino Oriente antico). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 302p. 13,6 x 21. Lit. 64.000

**Liverani**, Mario (a cura di), *Le lettere di el-Amarna*. 2. Le lettere dei "Grandi Re" (Testi del Vicino Oriente antico). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1999. Pp. 311-474. 13,6 x 21. Lit. 37.000

**Longenecker**, Richard N. (ed.), *Life in the Face of Death*. The Resurrection Message of the New Testament. Grand Rapids – Cambridge, W.B. Eerdmans, 1998. x-314p. 15,2 x 22,8. \$22.00 – £12.99

**Maccobi**, Hyam, *L'exécuteur sacré*. Le sacrifice humain et le legs de la culpabilité. Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1999. 255p. 15 x 23,5. FF 190

**Maggioli**, Andrea – **Maranesi**, Pietro (a cura di), *Bartolomeo Barbieri da Castelvetro (1615-1697)*. Un cappuccino alla scuola di San Bonventura nell'Emilia del '600. Roma, Istituto Storico dei Cappuccini, 1998. 644p. 17,1 x 24

**Marguerat**, Daniel – **Bourquin**, Yvan, *Pour lire les récits bibliques*. Initiation à l'analyse narrative. Paris, Éditions du Cerf – Genève, Labor et Fides – Montréal, Novalis, 1998. 241p. 21 x 21. FF 150

**Marshall, I. Howard – Peterson, David** (eds.), *Witness to the Gospel. The Theology of Acts*. Grand Rapids – Cambridge, UK, W.B. Eerdmans, 1998. xvi-610p. 15,2 x 22,8. \$45.00 – £29.99

**Masada VI. Yigael Yadin** Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports. **Talmon, Shemaryahu, Hebrew Fragments from Masada. Yadin, Yigael.** *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada*. Introduction, Emendation and Commentary. Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society, 1999. 252p. 25,3 x 31,7. \$80.00

**Miscall, Peter D.**, *Isaiah 34-35. A Nightmare/A Dream* (JSOTSS 281). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 148p. 16 x 24. £31.50 – \$52.50

**Mulder, Martin J.**, *1 Kings*. Volume 1: *1 Kings 1-11* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament). Leuven, Peeters, 1998. xxix-604p. 16 x 24. BF 2.100

**Neyrinck, F. – Verheyden, J. – Corstjens, R.**, *The Gospel of Matthew and the Sayings Source Q. A Cumulative Bibliography 1950-1995*. Volume One: *Alphabetical List*. Volume Two: *Table of Contents – Indexes* (BETL 140A-B). Leuven, University Press – Uitgeverij Peeters, 1998. Volume 1: 1000p Volume 2: 420p. 16 x 24,2. BF 3.800,—

**Oberlinner, Lorenz**, *Le lettere pastorali*. Tomo primo: *La prima lettera a Timoteo*. Testo greco e traduzione. Commento (Commentario teologico del Nuovo Testamento XI/2.1). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1999. 484p. 15,5 x 22,5. Lit. 89.000

**Onâte-Ojeda, Juan Ángel**, *El Paráclito y notas exegéticas sobre la Santísima Trinidad en San Juan* (Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer – Series Valentina 44). Valencia, Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer, 1998. 90p. 15,3 x 23,1

**Orsatti, Mauro**, *Armonia e tensioni nella comunità*. La Secondo Lettera ai Corinti (Bibbia e Spiritualità). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1998. 144p. 14,1 x 21. Lit. 18.000

**Pagolu, Augustine**, *The Religion of the Patriarchs* (JSOTSS 277). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 290p. 16 x 24. £50.00 – \$85.00

**Quesnel, Michel**, *Les chrétiens et la loi juive*. Une lecture de l'épître aux Romains (Lire la Bible). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1998. 124p. 11,8 x 18. FF 85

**Ravasi, Gianfranco**, *Lo Spirito Santo nelle Scritture*. Ciclo di conferenze tenute al Centro culturale S. Fedele di Milano (Conversazioni bibliche). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1998. 147p. 11,4 x 18,7. Lit. 19.000

ISSN 0006-0887

---

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

---

Finito di stampare il 6 settembre 1999

Tip. «Don Bosco» – Via Prenestina, 468 – 00171 Roma